

2fd

THE  
PARIAN CHRONICLE.

THE  
PARIAN CHRONICLE,

OR

THE CHRONICLE

OF THE

ARUNDELIAN MARBLES;

WITH

A DISSERTATION

CONCERNING ITS AUTHENTICITY.

J. ROBERTSON.

---

EA, QUÆ DISPUTAVI, DISSERERE MALUI, QUAM JUDICARE.  
CIC.

---

L O N D O N,

PRINTED FOR J. WALTER, CHARING-CROSS,

MDCCCLXXXVIII.

THE  
P R E F A C E.

**I**N a late publication, entitled, An Essay on Punctuation, the Author, having occasion to mention the celebrated Chronicle of the Arundelian Marbles, subjoins this note :

“ The Parian Chronicle is said to have been engraved 264 years before the Christian æra ; but is there no room to question its authenticity ? ”

This note occasioned the following letter in the Gentleman's Magazine.

“ The author of an Essay on Punctuation has thrown out a hint, which has surprised me not a little, as it will certainly do many others, viz. that there is some reason to question the authenticity of the Arundel Marbles.

“ I

“ I do not doubt the judgement of this writer ; but I wish to be informed by him, or any other competent judge, what foundation there is for this surmise.

A LOVER OF ANTIQUITIES.”

As I am thus desired to assign my REASONS for a question, which I proposed without any particular investigation, I shall freely and ingenuously submit them to the consideration of the learned reader,

I must however previously observe, that I propose my DOUBTS with the utmost deference to the sentiments of abler judges, and with the highest respect for those learned writers, who have given their sanction to the Parian Chronicle.

A D V E R.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

**T**HE original Greek, and the Latin translation, of the Chronicle, are taken from the elegant and accurate edition of the *Marmora Oxoniensia*, published by Dr. Chandler, in 1763.

The editions of Selden, Prideaux, and Maittaire, are much inferior to that of Dr. Chandler; and the translations, which have been made from them, by Count Scipio Maffei in Italian, M. Dufresnoy in French, and Dr. Playfair in English, are, on that account, proportionably defective.

In the following pages, the Greek is not divided into distinct epochas, like the Latin translation, but into lines, as it stands on the marble. This arrangement is preserved, with a design to give the reader some idea of the lacunæ in each line; though it must be observed, that there is not one line now remaining in its perfect state.

The

*The words and letters, which are added by the commentators, in order to supply the deficiencies in the Greek inscription, are placed between two brackets; and, in the English translation, the corresponding words and letters are printed in Italics.*

---

# CHRONICON PARIUM,

E X

## MARMORIBUS ARUNDELIANIS.

---

Lin. 1. . . . . ου . . . . . υπαν . . . . . ων  
. . . . . νων ανεγραψα τους αν[ωθεν

2. χρονους] αρχαμ[εν]ος απο Κεκροπος του πρωτου  
βασιλευσαντος Αθηνων, ειως αρχον[ος] εμ Παρω [μεν

3. Αστ]υανακτος, Αθηνησιν δε Διογνητου. Αφ ου  
Κεκροψ Αθηνων εβασιλευσε, και η χωρα Κεκροπια  
εκληθη, το προτερον καλου-

4. μενη Ακτικη απο Ακταιου του αυτοχθονος, ετη  
ΧΗΗΗΔΠΙΙΙ. Αφ ου Δευκαλιων παρὰ τον Παρ-  
νασσον εν Λυκωρεια εβασιλευσε, [βα]σιλε[υ

. . . . . de-  
scripsi superiora tempora orsus à Cecrope, qui primus  
regnavit Athenis, usque ad Archontem in Paro quidem  
Astyanaëtem, Athenis verò Diognetum.

*Epoch. 1.* A quo Cecrops Athenis regnavit, & regio  
Cecropia dicta est, quæ priùs dicebatur Aëtica ab Aëtæo  
indigenâ, anni MCCCXVIII.

*Ep. 2.* A quo Deucalion apud Parnassum in Lycoriâ  
regnavit, reg-



5. ο]ντος Αθηνων Κεκροπος, ετη ΧΗΗΗΔ. Αφ ου δικη Αθηνησι[ν εγε]νετο Αρει και Ποσειδωνι υπερ Αλιρροθιου του Ποσειδωνος, και ο τοπος εκληθη

6. Αρειος Παγος, ετη ΧΗΗΙΔΙΔΠΙΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Κρ[ανα]ου. Αφ ου κατακλυσμος επι Δευκαλιωνος εγενετο, και Δευκαλιων τους

7. ομβρους εφυγεν εγ Λυκωρειας εις Αθηνας προ[ς Κρανα]ον, και του Διο[ς του Ολυμπιου το ιερ]ον ιδ[ρυσατ]ο, [και] τα σωτηρια εθυσεν,

8. [ε]τη ΧΗΗΙΔΙΔΠ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Κρ[α]ν[α]ου. Α[φ ου Αμφι]κτυων Δευκαλιωνος εβασιλευσεν εν Θερμοπυλαις, και συνηγε

9. [τ]ους περι τον ορον οικουντας, και ω[νο]μασεν Αμφικτυονας, και Π[υλαια]ν, ου[περ] και νυν επι θυουσιν Αμφικτυονες,

10. [ε]τη ΧΗΗΙΔΙΠΙΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Αμ-  
nante Athenis Cecrope, anni MCCCX.

*Ep. 3.* A quo lis Athenis intercessit Marti & Neptuno super Halirrothio Neptuni *fili*o, & locus dictus est Arius Pagus, anni MCCLXVIII, regnante Athenis Cranao.

*Ep. 4.* A quo diluvium tempore Deucalionis evenit, & Deucalion imbres fugit è Lycoriâ Athenas ad Cranaum, & Jovis *Olympii* templum extruxit, & sacra pro salute fecit, anni MCCLXV, regnante Athenis Cranao.

*Ep. 5.* A quo Amphictyon Deucalionis *fili*us regnavit in Thermopylis, & congregavit populos in viciniâ habitantes, & appellavit Amphictyonas, & *Pylæam*, ubi & nunc etiam sacrificant Amphictyones, anni MCCLVIII, regnante Athenis Am-



φικτυονος. Αφ ου Ελλην ο Δευκ[αλιωνος Φθι]ωτιδος ε-  
βασιλευσε, και Ελληνες

11. [ων]ομασθησαν το προτερον Γραικαι καλουμενοι,  
και τον αγωνα Παναθ[η]ναι[κον συνεσησαντο, ετη]  
ΧΗΗΙΔΠΙΙ, βασιλευοντος

12. Αθηνων Αμφικτυονος. Αφ ου Καδμος ο Αγηνο-  
ρος εις Θηβας αφικετο [κατα χρησμον, και] εκτισεν  
την Καδμει-

13. αν, ετη ΧΗΗΙΔΠ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Αμ-  
φικτυονος. Αφ ου [Ευρωτας και Λακεδαιμων Λακω]-  
νικης εβασιλευσαν,

14. ετη ΧΗΗΙΔΠΙΙ βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Αμφικ-  
τυονος. Αφ ου ναυ[ς πεντ]η[κοντα κωπ]ων εξ Αι-  
γυπτου

15. [ε]ις την Ελλαδα επλευσε, και ωνομασθη Πεντη-  
κοντορος, και αι Δαναου θυγατερες . . . . . [Αμυμ]-  
ωνη, και Βα . .

phictyone.

*Ep. 6.* A quo Hellen Deucalionis *filius* in Phthiotide regnavit, & Hellenes appellati sunt, qui prius Græci dicebantur, & certamen Panathenaicum instituerunt, anni MCCLVII, regnante Athenis Amphictyone.

*Ep. 7.* A quo Cadmus Agenoris *filius* Thebas advenit *secundum oraculum*, & condidit Cadmeam, anni MCCLV, regnante Athenis Amphictyone.

*Ep. 8.* A quo *Eurotas* & *Lacedæmon* in Laconiâ regnârunt, anni MCCLII, regnante Athenis Amphictyone.

*Ep. 9.* A quo navis *cum quinquaginta remis* ab Ægypto in Græciam appullâ est, & vocata est Pentecontorus, & Danaï filiæ . . . . . Amymone, & Β . . . . .

## CHRONICON PARIUM,

16. . . λαρεῦω, και Ελικη και Αρχεδικη αποκληρω-  
θῆσαι υπο των λοιπων [ιερον ιδρυσ]αντ[ο,]

17. και εθυσαν επι της ακτης εμ παρα[λι]αδι εν  
Λινδω της Ροδιας, ετη ΧΗΗΔΔΔΔΠΙΙ, βασιλευσ[υ]-  
τος Αθηνων Εριχθονιου. Αφ ου Εριχ]-

18. θονιος Παναθηναίοις τοῖς πρώτοις γενομένοις αρ-  
μα εζευξε, και τον αγωνα εδεικνυε, και Αθηναι[α με-  
τω]ν[ομασε, κ]αι [αγαλμα της

19. Θ]εων μητρος εφανη εγ Κυβελοις, και Υαγνις ο  
Φρυξ αυλουσ πρώτος ηυρεν εγ Κ[ελαι]ναι[ς τη]ς Φρυ-  
γ[ι]ας, [και την Αρμονιαν την κ[α-

20. λουμενην Φρυγισι πρώτος ηυλησε, και αλλους  
νομους Μητρος, Διονυσου, Πανος, και τον επ[ιχωριων  
Θεων, και

21. Ηρωων,] ετη ΧΗΗΔΔΔΔΠΙ, βασιλευοντος  
Αθηνων Εριχθονιου του το αρμα ζευξαντος. Αφ ου Μινως

. . . . . & Helice, & Archedice forte lectæ à cæteris  
*templum condiderc*, & sacrificarunt super littus in mariti-  
mâ regione in Lindo, quæ Rhodi urbs est, anni  
MCCXLVII, regnante *Athenis Erichthonio*.

*Ep. 10. A quo Erichthonius Panathenæis primis cele-  
bratis currum junxit, & id certamen monstravit, & Athe-  
næων nomen mutavit, & simulachrum matris Deorum ap-  
paruit in Cybelis montibus, & Hyagnis Phryx tibias pri-  
mus invenit in Celænis urbe Phrygiæ, & harmoniam quæ  
vocatur Phrygia primus tibiis cecinit, & alios nomos  
magnæ Matris, Dionysi, Panis, & illum patriorum Deo-  
rum & Heroum, anni MCCXLII, regnante Athenis  
Erichthonio, qui currum junxit.*

*Ep. 11. A quo Minos ejus nominis*

[ο] πρ[ωτος ε]βα[σιλευσε,

22. και Κυ]δωνιαν οικισε, και σιδηρος ηυρεθη εν τη  
Ιδῃ, ευροντων των Ιδαιων Δακτυλων Κελμιος κ[αι Δαμ-  
νανεως, ετη ΧΗΙΔΙΔΠΙΙΙ,

23. βασι]λευοντος Αθηνων Πανδιονος. Αφ ου Δη-  
μητηρ αφικομενη εις Αθηνas καρπον εφυ[τε]υεν, και  
πρ[ος αλλους επεμφε πρ]ωτη δ[ια

24. Τ]ριπτολεμου του Κελεου και Νεαιρας, ετη  
ΧΗΔΔΔΔΠ βασιλευοντος Αθηνησιν Εριχθειας. Αφ ου  
Τριπτο[λεμος

25. καρπον] εσπειρεν εν τη Ραρια καλουμενη Ελευσινι,  
ετη Χ[Η]ΔΔΔΔ[ΙΙ], βασιλευοντος Αθηνων [Εριχ-  
θειας. Αφ ο-]

26. υ [Ορφευς την] αυτου ποιησιν εξ[ε]θηκε, Κορης  
τε αρπαγην, και Δημητρος ζητησιν, και τ[η]ν αυτου  
[καταβα-

primus regnavit, & Cydoniam condidit; & ferrum in-  
ventum est in Idâ, inventoribus Idæis Daëtylis Celmi &  
*Damnaneo, anni MCCLXVIII*, regnante Athenis Pan-  
dione.

*Ep. 12.* A quo Ceres adveniens Athenas fruges se-  
minavit, & ad *alias gentes misit* prima per Triptolemum  
*filium Celei & Neæræ*, anni MCXLV, regnante Athenis  
Erichtheo.

*Ep. 13.* A quo Triptolemus *fruges sevit* in Rhariâ  
dictâ Eleusine, anni MCXLII, regnante Athenis *Erich-*  
*theo.*

*Ep. 14.* A quo Orpheus ejus Poësin edidit, & Proser-  
pinæ raptum, & Cereris investigationem, & ipsius *ad In-*  
*feros descen-*

## 6 CHRONICON PARIUM,

27. σιν, και μυ]θο[υ]ς των υποδεξαμενων τον καρ-  
πον, ετη ΧΗΔΔΔΠ, βασιλευντος Αθηνων Εριχθεως.  
[Αφ ου

28. Ευμολπος ο Μουσαι]ου τα μυσηρια ανεφηνεν εν  
Ελευσινι, και τας του [πατρος Μ]ουσαιου ποιησ[ει]ς  
εξεθηκ[εν, ετη ΧΗ . . . βασιλευντος Αθηνων

29. Εριχθε]ως του Πανδιονος. Αφ ου καθαρισμος  
πρωτον εγενετο [δια φον]ου πρωτω αον . . . εαντ . . . . .

30. [ετη ΧΠΔ]ΔΙΙ, βασιλευντος Αθηνων Πανδιονος  
του Κεκροπος. Αφ ου [ε]ν Ελευσινι ο γυμνικος [αγων  
ετεθη, ετη Χ . . . , βασιλευντος Αθηνων Πανδιονος του  
Κεκροπος.] Αφ ου [αι ανθρωπο-

31. θυσι]αι, [και] τα Λυκαια εν Αρκαδια εγενετο,  
και λ . . κκε . . . . . Λυκαονος εδοθησαν [εν] τοις Ελ-  
λ[η]σι[ν, ετ]η [Χ] . ν . . βασιλευον-

*sum, & fabulas de iis, qui fruges accipiebant, anni  
MCXXXV, regnante Athenis Erichtheo.*

*Ep. 15. A quo Eumolpus Musæi filius mysteria exhi-  
buit in Eleusine, & patris sui Musæi poemata edidit, anni  
MC . . . , regnante Athenis Erichtheo filio Pandionis.*

*Ep. 16. A quo lustratio primò facta fuit per cædem . .  
. . . . . anni MLXII, regnante  
Athenis Pandione filio Cecropis.*

*Ep. 17. A quo in Eleusine gymnicum certamen propo-  
nebatur, anni M . . . . regnante Athenis Pandione filio Ce-  
cropis.*

*Ep. 18. A quo humana sacrificia, & Lycæa in Arca-  
diâ celebrata fuere, & . . . . . Lycaonis da-  
bantur inter Græcos, anni M . . . . . , regnan-*



32. τος Αθηνων Πανδιονος του Κεκροπος. Αφ ου κα[θαρισθεις εν Ελευσιν]ι Ηρακλης [εμυηθη ξεν]ω[ν πρωτ]ος, [ετη Χ] . . .

33. βασιλευοντος Αθηνησιν Αιγεως. Αφ ου Αθηνησι [σπανι]ς των καρπων εγενετο, και μαντευομενος [τοις] Αθην[αιοις Απολ]λων ην[αγκασεν

34. δικα]ς υποσχε[ι]ν, α[ς] αμ. Μινως αξιωσει, ετη ΧΔΔΔΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Αιγ[εως.] Αφ ου Θησ[ευσ]

35. Αθηνων τας δωδεκα πολεις εις το αυτο συνηκισεν, και πολιτειαν και την δημοκρατειαν [πρωτος καθ-

36. εσηκω]ς Αθηνων, τον των Ισθμιων αγωνα εθηκε, Σινιν αποκτεινας, ετη ΙΗΗΗΗΗΙΔΔΔΔΠ. Απο της Αρμον[ιας] τη[ς πρωτης, ετη ΙΗΗΗΗΗ

37. ΗΙΔ]ΔΔΔΔΙΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων Θησεως.

te Athenis Pandione filio Cecropis.

*Ep. 19.* A quo lustratus in Eleusine Hercules initiatus fuit hospitum primus, anni M. . regnante Athenis Ægeo.

*Ep. 20.* A quo Athenis inopia frugum contigit, & consultus ab Atheniensibus Apollo coegit eos pœnas subire, quascunque Minos postularet, anni MXXXI, regnante Athenis Ægeo.

*Ep. 21.* A quo Theseus Athenis duodecim urbes in unam civitatem collegit, & reipublicæ formam & statum popularem cum primus constituisset Athenis, Isthmiorum certamen proposuit, postquam Sinin occiderat, anni DCCCCLXXXV.

*Ep. 22.* A festo Ammon dicto primùm celebrato, anni DCCCCLXXXII, regnante Athenis Theseo.

Αφ ου Αργειοι[σιν] Αδρα[τος ε]βασιλευσ[ε]ν, και τον  
αγωνα [ε]ν [Νεμεα ε]θ[εσ]αν [οι

38. Επτα,] ετη ΠΗΗΗΗΗΠΙΔΔΔΠΙΙ, βασι-  
λευοντος Αθηνων Θησεως. Αφ ου οι [Ελλη]νες εις  
Τροιαν ε[ς]ρατευ[σαν,] ετη ΠΗΗΗΗΗΠΙΙΙΙ, βασι-  
λευοντος Αθη[νων

39. Μεν]εσθεως τρεις και δεκατου ετους. Αφ ου  
Τροια ηλω, ετη ΠΗΗΗΗΗΔΔΔΔΠ, βασιλευοντος  
Αθηνων [Μενεσθε] ως, [εικοσου και] δευτερου ετους, μη-  
νος Θ[αρ-

40. γηλιω]κος εβδομη φθινοντος. Αφ ου Ορεση[ς εν  
Σκυθ]ια των αυτο[υ μανιων ιαθη, και Α]ιγισθου θυγα-  
τρι [Ηριγ]ον[η υπερ Αι]γισθου και αυ[τῳ δικη

41. εγενετ]ο εν Αρειου Παγω, ην Ορεσης ενικησεν  
[ισων ψηφ]ων [ουσων,] ετη [ΠΗ]ΗΗΗΗΔΔΔ[Δ]ΙΙ,

*Ep. 23.* A quo Argivorum *Adrastus* rex fuit, & cer-  
tamen in Nemeâ propofuerunt Septem Duces, anni  
DCCCCLXXXVII, regnante Athenis Theseo.

*Ep. 24.* A quo Græci ad Trojam expeditionem sus-  
ceperunt, anni DCCCCLIV, regnante Athenis Me-  
nestheo, anno *regni ejus* decimo tertio.

*Ep. 25.* A quo Troja capta fuit, anni DCCCC  
XLV, regnante Athenis *Meneſtheo*, *vicesimo* secundo  
*regni ejus* anno, mensis Thargelionis die septimo ante  
finem.

*Ep. 26.* A quo Orestes in Scythiâ ab *infaniâ suâ*  
*liberatus* fuit, & Ægisthi filiæ Erigonæ de Ægisto  
& illi *lis* intercessit in Arcopago, in quâ Orestes  
vicit *aqualibus numero suffragiis existentibus*, anni  
DCCCCXLII,

βασιλευντος Αθηνων Δημοφωντος. Αφ ου [Σαλα-  
42. μινα εν] Κυπρω Τευκρος ωκισεν, ετη ΙΗΙΗΙΗ  
ΗΔΔΔΠΙΙΙ, βασιλευντος Αθηνων Δημοφωντος. Αφ  
ου Νη[λ]εὺς ωκισ[εν] ἐγ Καρια Μιλητον αγειρας Ιωνας,  
οι

43. ωκισ]αν Εφεσον, Ερυθρας, Κλαζομενας, [Πριη-  
νην, και Λεβεδον, Τηω,] Κολοφωνα, [Μ]υσυντα, [Φω-  
καιαν,] Σαμον, [Χιον, και] τα [Παν]ιωνι[α] εγενετο,  
ετ[η]

44. ΙΗΗΗΗ]ΔΙΙΙ, βασιλευντος Αθηνων Με[δον-  
το]ς τρεις και δεκατου [ετ]ους. Αφ ου [Ησ]ιοδος ο  
ποιητης [εφαν]η, ετη ΙΗΗΙΔΔΔ[Δ, βασιλευντος Α-  
θηνων Με-

45. γακλους.] Αφ ου Ομηρος ο ποιητης εφανη, ετη  
ΙΗΗΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, βασιλευντος Αθηνω[ν Δ]ιογνητου.

regnante Athenis Demophonte.

*Ep. 27.* A quo *Salamina* in *Cypro* *Teucer* condidit,  
anni DCCCCXXVIII, regnante Athenis Demo-  
phonte.

*Ep. 28.* A quo *Neleus* condidit in *Cariâ Miletum*  
*congregatis Ionibus qui condiderunt Ephesum, Erythras,*  
*Clazomenas, Prienen, & Lebedum, Teon, Colophonem,*  
*Myuntem, Phoccam, Samum, Chium, & Panionia insti-*  
*tuta fuere,* anni DCCCXIII, regnante Athenis *Medonte*,  
anno decimo tertio.

*Ep. 29.* A quo *Hesiodus* poeta claruit, anni DCLX  
XX, regnante Athenis *Megacle*.

*Ep. 30.* A quo *Homerus* poeta claruit, anni DCX  
LIII, regnante Athenis *Diogneto*.



10 CHRONICON PARIUM,

Αφ ου Φ[ει]δων ο Αργειος εδημ[εύθη, και μετρα και

46. σαθμα] εσκευασε και νομισμα αργυρου εν Αι-  
γυνη εποικησεν, ενδεκατος ων αφ Ηρακλους ετη ΙΗΗΔΔ  
ΔΙ, βασιλευοντος Αθηνων [Φε-

47. ρεκλε]ους. Αφ ου Αρχιας Ευαγητου δεκατος  
ων απο Τημενου εκ Κορινθου ηγαγε την αποικιαν [εις]  
Συρακού[σας, ετη ΗΗΗΗΠΙΔΔΔΔΙΙΙΙ,

48. βασιλευον]τος Αθηνων Ασχυλου ετους εικοσου  
και ενος. Αφ ου κατ ενιαυτον ηρ[ξ]εν[ο Κ]ρ[ε]ων,  
ετ[η] ΗΗΗΗΔΔ. Αφ ου [Λακεδαιμ]ο[νιοις Τ]υ[ρ-

49. ταιος συνεμαχησεν,] ετη ΗΗΗΗΔΠΙΙΙ, Αρ-  
χοντος Αθηνησι Λυσι[ου.] Αφ ου Τερπανδρος ο Δερδενεος  
ο Λεσβιος τους νομους του[ς π]α[λαι]ων [καιν]ουσθαι  
αυλητ[ας

50. εθε]λησε, και την εμπροσθε μουσικην μετεσησεν,

*Ep. 31. A quo Phidon Argivus proscriptus fuit, & mensuras atque pondera paravit, & nummum argenteum in Ægina cudit, undecimus ab Hercule, anni DCXXXI, regnante Athenis Pherecte.*

*Ep. 32. A quo Archias Euageti filius, decimus a Temeno, e Corintho eduxit coloniam Syracusas, anni CCC CXCIII, regnante Athenis Æschylo, anno vicessimo primo.*

*Ep. 33. A quo annuus Archon exstitit primus Creon, anni CCCCXX.*

*Ep. 34. A quo cum Lacedæmoniis Tyræus militavit, anni CCCCXVIII, Archonte Athenis Lyfiâ.*

*Ep. 35. A quo Terpander Derdenei filius Lesbicus nomos antiquos novare auletas voluit, & vetustam musicam mutavit,*

ετ[η] ΗΗΗΠΙΔΔΔΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Δρωπιλου.  
Αφ ου Α[λυαττη]ς Λυδ[ων εβα]σιλευσ[εν, ετη

51. ΗΗΗΔ]ΔΔΔΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αριστοκλεους.  
Αφ ου Σαπφω εγ Μιτυληνης εις Σικελιαν επλευσε  
φυγουσα, . . . . . ολ . . . . . θ . . . . . [ετη ΗΗ  
ΗΔΔΠΙΙΙ,

52. Αρχον]τος Αθηνησιν μεν Κριττιου του προτερου,  
εν Συρακουσαις δε των [Γεω]μορων κατεχοντων την αρ-  
χην. [Αφ ου Αμφικτυονες ενικη-

53. σαν ελ]ουτες Κυρραν, και ο αγων ο γυμνικος  
ετεθη χρηματιτης απο των λαφυρων, ετη ΗΙΙ[Η]ΔΔΠ  
ΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Σιμω[ν]ος. Αφ ου

54. [ο γεφ]ανιτης αγων παλιν ετεθη, ετη ΗΗΗΔ  
[Δ]ΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Δαμασιου του δευτερου.  
Αφ ου εν α[πην]αις Κωμω[δια] εφορεθησαν υ-

anni CCCLXXXI, Archonte Athenis Dropilo.

*Ep.* 36. A quo *Alyattes* in *Lydiâ* regnavit, anni CCC  
XLI, Archonte Athenis Aristocle.

*Ep.* 37. A quo *Sappho* e *Mitylene* in *Siciliam* traje-  
cit fugiens . . . . . anni CCCXXVIII, Archonte  
Athenis quidem *Critiâ* priore, *Syracufis* autem rerum  
potitis *Geomoris*.

*Ep.* 38. A quo *Amphiclyones* vicerunt captâ *Cyrrhâ*, &  
certamen gymnicum editum fuit pecuniarium ex spoliis,  
anni CCCXXVII, Archonte Athenis Simone.

*Ep.* 39. A quo coronarium certamen iterum editum  
fuit, anni CCCXXII, Archonte Athenis *Damasiâ* se-  
cundo.

*Ep.* 40. A quo in plaustris comœdiæ vectæ fuerunt

55. πο] των Ικαριων, ευροντος Σουσαριωνος, και  
αθλον ετεθη πρωτον ισχαδων αρσιχο[ς] και οινου [αμ-  
φορευσ, ετη ΗΗ . . . Αρχοντος Αθηνησι . . . . .

56. . .] Αφ ου Πεισιγρατος Αθηνων ετυραννευσεν,  
ετη ΗΗΙΔΔΔΔΠΙΙ, Αρχοντος [Αθηνησ], Κ[ωμι]-  
ου. Αφ ου Κροισος [εξ] Ασιας [εις] Δελφο[υ]ς α-  
[πεπεμψεν,

57. ετη ΗΗΙΔ]ΔΔΔΔΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι[ν Ευ-  
θυ]δημου. Αφ ου Κυρος ο Περσων βασιλευς Σαρδεις  
ελαβε, και Κροισου υπο [Πυθι]ης σφαλ[λομενον εζω-  
γρησεν, ετη ΗΗΙΔΔΔΔΠ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Ερξι-  
κλειδου.

58. Ην δε] και Ιππωναξ κατα τουτον ο Ιαμβοποιος.  
Αφ ου Θεςπης ο ποιητης [εφανη, πρωτος ος και] εδιδαξε  
[Τραγωδιαν, ης αθλον ε]τεθη ο [τ]ραγος, ετη ΗΗΙΔ[Δ  
ΔΙΙΙ,] Αρχοντος Αθ[ηνησιν

ab Icarientibus, inventore Sufarione; & præmium posi-  
tum fuit primum ficuum cophinus & vini *dolium*, anni  
CC . . . *Archonte Athenis* . . . . .

*Ep. 41.* A quo Pisistratus Athenis tyrannidem occu-  
pavit, anni CCLXXXVII, Archonte Athenis *Comiâ*.

*Ep. 42.* A quo Cræsus *ex Asiâ ad Delphos misit*, anni  
CCXCII, Archonte Athenis Euthydemo.

*Ep. 43.* A quo Cyrus Persarum rex Sardes expugna-  
vit, & Cræsum a Pythiâ deceptum *vivum cepit*, anni CC  
LXXV Archonte Athenis *Erxiclide*. *Vixit autem et*  
Hipponax hujus tempore Iambicus poeta.

*Ep. 44.* A quo Thespis poeta *floruit*, qui porro primus  
docuit *Tragædiam*, *cujus præmium* fuit hircus, anni CCI,  
XXIII, Archonte Athenis

59. Αλκ]αίου του προτερου. Αφ ου Δαρείος Περσων  
εβασίλευσε, Μαγου τελευτησαντος, ετη [ΗΗ]ΙΔΙ[Π]Ι,  
Αρχοντος Αθη[νησι] . . . . Αφ ου Αρμόδιος και [Α-  
ριστογε]ιτων απεκτε[ιναν

60. Ιππα]ρχον Πεισιστρατου Α[θηνων τυρανν]ον,  
και Αθηναίοι σ[υνανες]ησαν τους Πεισιστρατίδας εκ-  
[βαλλειν του Πελασγικ]ου τειχους, ετη ΗΗΔΔΔΔΙΙ  
ΙΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησι

61. [Κλισθενους.] Αφ ου χοροι πρωτον ηγωνισαντο  
ανδρων, ου διδαξας Υπο[δι]κος Χαλκιδε[υς] ενικ[ησεν],  
ετη ΗΗΔΔΔ[ΔΙΙΙΙ], Αρχοντος Αθηνησι[ν Ι[σαγο-  
ρου. Αφ ου νε[ως Αθηνας της] Ιππια[ς ιδρυσ-

62. θη]. Αθηνησιν, ετη ΗΗΔΔΔΙ, Αρχοντος Αθη-  
νησι Πυθοκριτου. Αφ ου εμ Μαραθωνι μαχη εγενετο

*Alcæo priore.*

*Ep. 45. A quo Darius in Persia regnavit, Mago de-  
functo, anni CCLVI, Archonte Athenis . . . .*

*Ep. 46. A quo Harmodius & Aristogiton interfecerunt Hipparchum Pisistrati filium Athenarum tyrannum, & Athenienses consurrexerunt ut Pisistratidas ejicerent ex Pelasgico muro, anni CCXLVIII, Archonte Athenis Clisthene.*

*Ep. 47. A quo chori primùm certârunt virorum, cujusmodi primum cum docuisset Hypodicus Chalcidensis, vicit, anni CCXXXIV, Archonte Athenis Isagora.*

*Ep. 48. A quo templum Minervæ Hippiae structum fuit Athenis, anni CCXXXI, Archonte Athenis Pythocrito.*

*Ep. 49. A quo in Marathone pugna commissâ est*



Αθηναίοις προς τους Πέρσας, [και Αρταφερνεα το]ν Δαρ-  
ρειου αδελ-

63. [φιδεο]ν, τον στρατηγον ενικων Αθηναίοι, ετη  
ΗΗΔΔΠΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθην[ησι του] δευτερου [Φαι-  
νιππου, και] εν μαχη συνηγωνισατο Αισχυλος ο ποιητης

64. [ετ]ω[ν] ων ΔΔΔΠ. Αφ ου Σιμωνιδης ο Σι-  
μωνιδου παππος του ποιητου, ποιητης ων και [αυτος  
Αθη]νησι, και Δαρειος τελευτα, Ξερξης δε ο υιος βασι-  
λευει, [ετη

65. ΗΗΔ]ΔΠ[Ι], Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αρισειδου.  
Αφ ου Αισχυλος ο ποιητης τραγωδια πρωτον ενικησε,  
και Ευριπιδης ο ποιητης εγενετο, και Στησιχορος ποιη-  
της ε[ις]

66. την Ελλαδα αφικετ]ο, ετη ΗΗΔΔΙΙ, Αρχον-  
τος Αθηνησι Φιλοκρατους. Αφ ου Ξερξης την σχεδιαν

ab Atheniensibus contra Persas, & Artaphernem Darii  
nepotem, ducem, superârunt Athenienses, anni CCXX  
VII, Archonte Athenis secundo *Phænippo*, & in prælio  
unâ certavit Æschylus poeta *cum esset annos natus*  
XXXV.

*Ep. 50.* A quo Simonides Simonidis avus poetæ, po-  
eta fuit qui & *ipse* Athenis; & Darius obiit, Xerxes  
verò filius *ejus* regnavit, anni CCXXVI, Archonte  
Athenis Aristide.

*Ep. 51.* A quo Æschylus poeta tragœdiâ primùm vi-  
cit, & Euripides poeta natus fuit, & Stesichorus poeta *in*  
Græciam *venit*, anni CCXXII, Archonte Athenis Phi-  
locrate.

*Ep. 52.* A quo Xerxes navigiorum pontem

ἔξευξεν ἐν Ἑλλησποντῷ, καὶ τὸν Ἀθῶ διωρυξέ, καὶ ἡ ἐν  
Θερμο-

67. [πυ]λαῖς μάχη ἐγένετο, καὶ ναυμαχία τοῖς  
Ἑλλήσι περὶ Σαλαμῖνα πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας, ἣν ἐνίκων οἱ  
Ἕλληνες, ἐτὴ ἩΗΔΠΙΙ, Ἀρχὸντος Ἀθηνησὶ Καλλιὰδου.  
Ἀφ' οὗ ἡ ἐν

68. [Π]λαταιαῖς μάχη ἐγένετο Ἀθηναίοις πρὸς  
Μαρδόνιον τὸν Ξερξέου στρατηγόν, ἣν ἐνίκων Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ  
Μαρδόνιος ἐτελευτήσεν ἐν τῇ μάχῃ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐρύη[σε

69. ἐν Σικ]ελίᾳ περὶ τὴν Αἰτνίαν, ἐτὴ Η[Η]ΔΠΙ,  
Ἀρχὸντος Ἀθηνησὶ Ξαντίππου. Ἀφ' οὗ [Γε]λῶν.ο Δει-  
νομένους [Συρακουσῶν] ἐτυράννευσεν, ἐτὴ ΙΗΗΔΠ, Ἀρ-  
χὸντος Ἀθηνησὶ Τιμοσθέν-

70. [ους. Α]φ' οὗ Σιμωνίδης ὁ Λεωπρέπους ὁ Κείος,  
ὁ το μνημονικὸν εὖρων, ἐνίκησεν Ἀθηνησὶν διδασκῶν, καὶ

junxit in Hellesponte, & Athonem perfodit, & in Ther-  
mopylis pugna commissa fuit, & pugna navalis a Græcis  
ad Salaminem contra Persas, in qua vicerunt Græci,  
anni CCXVII, Archonte Athenis Calliade.

*Ep. 53.* A quo ad Plateas pugna commissa fuit ab  
Atheniensibus contra Mardonium Xerxis ducem, in qua  
vicerunt Athenienses, & Mardonius occubuit in pugna,  
& ignis defluxit in Sicilia circa Ætnam, anni CCXVI,  
Archonte Athenis Xantippo.

*Ep. 54.* A quo Gelon Dinomenis filius Syracusis ty-  
rannidem occupavit, anni CCXV, Archonte Athenis  
Timosthene.

*Ep. 55.* A quo Simonides Leoprepis filius Ceius, quī  
memorandi artem invenit, vicit Athenis docens, &

αι εικονες εσταθησαν Αρμοδιου και Αριστογειτονος, ετη  
ΗΗ[ΔΙΙΙΙ,]

71. Αρχοντος Αθηνησι[ν Α]δειμαντου. Αφ ου Ιερων  
Συρακουσων ετυραννευσεν, ετη ΗΗΠΙ[Ι]ΙΙ, Αρχοντός  
Αθηνησι Χ[αρ]ητος. Ην δε και Επιχαρμος ο ποιητης  
κατα του-

72. του. Αφ ου Σοφοκλης ο Σοφιλλου ο εκ Κολωνου  
ενικησε τραγωδια, ετων ων ΔΔΠΙΙΙ, ετη ΗΗΠΙ, Αρ-  
χοντος Αθηνησιν Αψηφιονος. Αφ ου εν Αιγος ποταμοις  
ο λιθος επεσε,

73. και Σιμωνιδης ο ποιητης ετελευτησεν, βιους ετη  
ΙΔΔΔΔΔ, ετη ΗΗΠ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Θεαγενιδου.  
Αφ ου Αλεξανδρος ετελευτησεν, ο δε υιος Πε[ρ]δικ-

74. κας Μακεδονων εβασιλευεν, ετη ΗΙΔΔΔΔΠ  
[ΙΙΙ,] Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Ευθιππου. Αφ ου Αισχυλος

statuæ positæ fuerunt Harmodii & Aristogitonis, anni  
CCXIV, Archonte Athenis Adimanto.

*Ep.* 56. A quo Hiero Syracusis tyrannidem occupa-  
vit, anni CCIX, Archonte Athenis Charete. Vixit au-  
tem & Epicharmus poeta hujus tempore.

*Ep.* 57. A quo Sophocles Sophilli *filius*, qui e Colono  
fuit, vicit tragœdiâ, cùm esset annos natus XXVIII, anni  
CCVI, Archonte Athenis Apsephione.

*Ep.* 58. A quo in Ægos flumen lapis cecidit, & Si-  
monides poeta obiit, cùm vixisset annos XC, anni CCV,  
Archonte Athenis Theagenidâ.

*Ep.* 59. A quo Alexander obiit, filius autem illius  
Perdiccas apud Macedonas regnavit, anni CXCVIII,  
Archonte Athenis Euthippo.

*Ep.* 60. A quo Æschylus



ο πο[ι]ητης βιωσας ετη ΙΔΙΔΠΙΙΙΙ ΕΤΕΛΕΥΤΗΣΕΝ ΕΝ [Γε-

75. λ]α της [Σι]κελιας, ετη ΗΙΔΙΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησ[ι] Καλλ[ι]στου του προτερου. Αφ ου Ευριπιδης ετων ων ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ τραγωδια πρωτον ενικησεν, ετη ΗΙΔΙΔ[ΔΠΙΙΙΙ,]

76. Αρχοντος Αθηνησι Διφι[λου. Η]σαν δε κατα Ευριπιδην Σωκρατης, και [Ανα]ξαγορας. Αφ ου Αρχελαος Μακεδωνων εβασιλευσε Περδικκου τελευτησαντος, ετη Η[ΙΔΙΠΙ,

77. Αρχ]οντος Αθηνησι Ασυφλου. Αφ ου Διονυσιος Συρακουσων ετυραννευσεν, ετη ΗΔΔΔΔΙΙΙΙ, Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Ευκτημονος. Αφ ου Ευριπιδης βι[ωσας ετη ΙΔΙΔΔΠΙΙ

78. ετε]λευτησεν, ετη ΗΔΔΔΔ[ΙΙΙ,] Αρχοντος Αθηνησιν Αντιγενους. Α[φ] ου Σο[φ]οκλης ο ποιητης

poeta, cùm vixisset annos LXIX, obiit in *Gela* Siciliae, anni CXCI, Archonte Athenis Callia primo.

*Ep. 61.* A quo Euripides, cùm esset annorum XLIII, tragœdiâ primùm vicit, anni CLXXIX, Archonte Athenis Diphilo. Vixerunt verò tempore Euripidis Socrates & Anaxagoras.

*Ep. 62.* A quo Archelaus in Macedonia regnavit, Perdiccâ defuncto, anni CLVI, Archonte Athenis Astyphilo.

*Ep. 63.* A quo Dionysius Syracusis tyrannidem occupavit, anni CXLIV, Archonte Athenis Euctemone.

*Ep. 64.* A quo Euripides, cùm vixisset annos LXXVII, obiit, anni CXLIII, Archonte Athenis Antigene.

*Ep. 65.* A quo Sophocles poeta,

βίωσας ἐτη [ΙΔ]ΔΔΔΔΙ ἐτελεύτησεν, καὶ Κύρος  
ἀνέβ[η]σε ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν, ἐτη ΙΙΔΔΔΔΙΙ,

79. Ἀρχ[ον]τος Ἀθηνησὶ Καλλίου τοῦ Πρ.τ.οῦ.  
Ἀφ' οὗ Τελέτης Σελ[ινουντίος] ἐνίκησεν Ἀθηνησιν, ἐτη  
ΗΔΔΔΠ[ΙΙΙ], Ἀρχοντος Ἀθηνησὶ Μικῶνος. Ἀφ' οὗ  
[ἐπανηλθόν] οἱ

80. μετ[ὰ] Κυροῦ ἀναβάντες, καὶ Σωκράτης φιλο-  
σοφ[ος] ἐτελεύτησε [βίους] ἐτη ΙΔΙΔΔ, ἐτη ΗΔΔΔΠ  
[Ι], Ἀρχοντος Ἀθηνησὶ Λαχίτος. Ἀφ' οὗ Λ[εὺδαμ]ας  
πρῶτον ἐδίδαξεν]

81. Ἀθηνησιν, ἐτη ΗΔΔΔΠ, Ἀρχοντος Ἀθηνησιν  
Ἀριστοκράτους. Ἀφ' οὗ Ξ[άνθος] ὁ ποιητὴς Σαρδ[ιαν]ος  
διθυραμβῶ ἐνίκησεν Ἀθηνησιν, ἐτη ΙΙ. . [Ἀρχοντος Ἀθη-  
νησι . . . . .

82. Ἀφ' οὗ Φιλοξένος διθυραμβοποιὸς τελευτᾷ βίους  
ἐτη ΙΔΠ, ἐτη ΙΙΔΠΙ, Ἀρχοντος Ἀθηνησὶ Πυθεοῦ.

cùm vixisset annos XCI, obiit, & Cyrus invasit fratrem  
ejus, anni CXLII, Archonte Athenis Calliâ . . . . .

Ep. 66. A quo Telestes Selinuntius vicit Athenis,  
anni CXXXVIII, Archonte Athenis Micone.

Ep. 67. A quo ii rediêre qui cum Cyro iverunt, & So-  
crates philosophus obiit cùm vixisset annos LXX, anni  
CXXXVI, Archonte Athenis Lachete.

Ep. 68. A quo Astydamas primùm docuit Athenis, anni  
CXXXV, Archonte Athenis Aristocrate.

Ep. 69. A quo Xanthus poeta Sardianus dithyrambo  
vicit Athenis anni C . . . Archonte Athenis . . . . .

Ep. 70. A quo Philoxenus dithyramborum scriptor  
obiit, cùm vixisset annos LV, anni CXVI, Archonte  
Athenis Pytheâ.

Αφ ου Αναξανδριδης ο κωμ[ωδοποιος] ενίκησεν Αθηνησιν,  
ετη ΗΔΙΙΙ, Αρχοντας]

83. Αθηνησι Καλλεου. Αφ ου Ασυδαμας Αθηνησιν  
ενίκησεν, ετη ΗΠΙΙΙΙ, Αρχοντας Αθηνησιν Λσειου.  
Κατεκαη δε τότε κα[ι] εν ουρανῳ η μεγαλη λαμπας.  
Αφ ου εν Λευκτροις

84. μαχη ε]γενετο Θηβαιων και Λακεδαιμονιων, ην  
ενικων Θηβαιοι, ετη ΗΠΙΙ, Αρχοντας Αθηνησιν Φρασι-  
κλειδου. [Κατα τουτου δε και Αλεξανδρος ο Αμυντου  
Μακεδονων]

85. βασιλευει. Αφ ου Στησιχορος ο Ιμερσιος ο  
δευτερος ενίκησεν Αθηνησιν, και ωκισθη Μεγαληπολ[ις] εν  
Αρκαδια, ετη ΗΠΙ, Αρχοντας Αθηνησι Δυσκινητου.]

86. Αφ ου Διονυσιος Σικελιωτης ετελευτησεν, ο δε υιος

*Ep. 71. A quo Anaxandrides comicus poeta vicit  
Athenis, anni CXIII, Archonte Athenis Calleá.*

*Ep. 72. A quo Astydamas Athenis vicit, anni CIX,  
Archonte Athenis Asteio. Exarsit autem tunc & in  
cælo magna lampas.*

*Ep. 73. A quo in Leuctris pugna commissâ fuit inter  
Thebanos & Lacedæmonios, in quâ vicerunt Thebani,  
anni CVII, Archonte Athenis Phrasticlides. Hujus au-  
tem tempore Alexander Amyntæ filius in Macedoniâ reg-  
navit.*

*Ep. 74. A quo Stesichorus Himeræus secundus vicit  
Athenis, & condita fuit Megalopolis in Arcadiâ, anni  
CVI, Archonte Athenis Dyscinito.*

*Ep. 75. A quo Dionysius Siculus obiit, filius autem  
ejus*

Διονυσίος ἐτυράννευσεν, καὶ Ἀλε[ξάνδρου] τελευτήσαντος Πτολεμαῖος Μακεδόνων

87. βασι]λεύει, ἐτῆ ΗΙΙΙΙ, Ἀρχόντος Ἀθηνησὶ Ναυσιγενούς. Ἀφ' οὗ Φωκεῖς τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς [ἱερὸν ἐσύλευσαν, ἐτῆ ΙΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, Ἀρχόντος Ἀθην-]

88. ῆσι Κηφισοδώρου. Ἀφ' οὗ Τιμοθεὸς βιώσας ἐτῆ ΙΔΔΔΔ ἐτελεύτησεν, [ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος Ἀμύντου τῶν Μα-]

89. κεδόνων βασιλεύει, καὶ Ἀρτοξερξῆς ἐτελεύτησεν· Ὡχος δὲ ὁ υἱὸς β[ασιλεύει τῶν Περσῶν, καὶ] . . . . .

90. . . . . ἐνίκησεν, ἐτῆ ΙΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, Ἀρχόντος Ἀθηνησὶν Ἀγαθοκλε[ους. Ἀφ' οὗ Ἀλεξάνδρος ὁ Φίλιπ-

91. πού ἐγενέ]το, ἐτῆ ΙΔΔΔΔΙ, Ἀρχόντος Ἀθηνησὶ Καλλισ[τρατου, . . . . . Ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ

Dionysius tyrannidem occupavit, & *Alexandro defuncto*, *Ptolemæus in Macedoniâ* regnavit, anni CIV, Archonte Athenis Naufigene.

Ep. 76. A quo Phocenses Delphicum templum spoliârunt, anni LXXXVIII, Archonte Athenis Cephisodoro.

Ep. 77. A quo Timotheus cum vixisset annos LXXIX obiit, *Philippus autem Amyntæ filius in Macedonia* regnavit, & Artaxerxes obiit, Ochus verò filius *ejus* regnavit in Persia, & . . . . . vicit, anni LXXXIII, Archonte Athenis Agathocle.

Ep. 78. A quo Alexander Philippi filius natus fuit, anni LXXXI, Archonte Athenis Callistrato . . . . .

. . . . . Vixit autem & Aristoteles

92. φιλο]σοφος κατα τουτο[ν.] Αφ ου Κα . . . .  
 . . . . .

93. . . . [ετ]η ΙΔΙ . . . . Αρχοντος . . . . .

philosophus hujus tempore.

Ep. A quo Ca . . . . . anni L . . . . Ar-  
 chonte . . . . .

*Cætera desiderantur.*



## A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

*IN order to give the English reader a proper notion of the lacunæ in this inscription, and to discriminate the assertions of the author from the conjectures of the commentators, the translator has followed the original, as closely as possible, without any regard to elegance of style.*

---

T H E

P A R I A N   C H R O N I C L E.

---

\* \* \* \* \* I have described *preceding times*, beginning from Cecrops, the first who reigned at Athens, to *Astyanax*, archon in Paros, and Diognetus at Athens \*.

Bef. Chr.

Epoc. 1. Since Cecrops reigned at Athens, and the country was named Cecropia, before called Aëtica, from Aëtæus, a native †, 1318 years.        -        -        -

1582

2. Since Deucalion reigned near Parnassus ‡, in Lycoria, Cecrops reigning at Athens, 1310 years.        -        -        -

1574

\* Diognetus was archon, Olymp. cxxix. 1. that is, bef. Chr. 264 years.

† *Αυτοχθών*, *autochthon*, an original inhabitant of the country.

‡ *Παρα τον Πηνασσον*, apud Parnassum. Lycorea, or Lycoria, was a town on the top of Parnassus. Those who were able to fly from the deluge, says Pausanias, retired *εσ' τα ακρη*, to the summits of Parnassus, and there built a city, which they called Lycorea. Pausan. l. x. c. 6. Strab. l. ix. p. 640. I do not find, that the country near Parnassus was ever distinguished by that name. Vid. Steph. Suidas, &c.

3. Since



## 24 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

3. Since the cause was *tried* at Athens between Mars and Neptune, concerning Halirrothius [the son] of Neptune, and the place was called Areopagus, 1268, Cranaus reigning at Athens. - - -

Bef. Chr.

1532

4. Since the deluge happened in the time of Deucalion; and Deucalion escaped the rains [and went] from Lycoria to Athens, to Cranaus, and built *the temple* of Jupiter Olympius, and offered sacrifices for his preservation, 1265 years, Cranaus reigning at Athens. - - -

1529

5. Since Amphietyon [the son] of Deucalion reigned in Thermopylæ, and assembled the people inhabiting that district, and called them Amphietyones, and [the place of council] Pylæa, where the Amphietyones still sacrifice, 1258 years, Amphietyon reigning at Athens \*. - - -

1522

6. Since Hellen [the son] of Deucalion reigned in Phthiotis, and they were named Hellenes, who before were called Graikoi [Greeks] and *they instituted* the Panathenæan † agon [games] 1257 years, Amphietyon reigning at Athens. - - -

1521

\* Suidas says, ὁ τοπος, the place, where the Amphietyones assembled, and the assembly itself, were called πυλαία. Suid. in v. Πυλαγῆσαι. Strab. l. ix. p. 643.

It is observed by M. Goguet, that the marbles distinguish very plainly Amphietyon, the son of Deucalion, from Amphietyon, king of Athens. Goguet, Orig. of Laws, &c. b. i. c. 1. But if this be the case, the marbles are expressly contradicted by Apollodorus, who asserts, that Amphietyon, the son of Deucalion, reigned μετὰ Κραναοῦ, with Cranaus, at Athens. Apollod. l. i. c. 7. § 2.

† See note to Epoc. 10.

10. Since

7. Since Cadmus [the son] of Agenor came to Thebes *, according to the oracle, and built Cadmea, 1255 years, Amphictyon reigning at Athens. - - -	Bef. Chr.
	1519
8 Since Eurotas and Lacedæmon reigned in Laconia, 1252 years, Amphictyon reigning at Athens. - - -	1516
9. Since a ship with fifty oars sailed from Egypt to Greece, and was called Pentecontorus, and the daughters of Danaus . . . . . . . . . . Anymone and Ba . . . . . and Helice and Archedice, elected by the rest, built a temple, and sacrificed upon the shore, in the maritime country †, in Lindus [a city] of Rhodes, 1247 years, Erichthonius reigning at Athens. - - -	1514
10. Since Erichthonius, the first Panathenæa ‡ being celebrated, yoked [horses to] a cha-	

\* Diodorus and Eusebius make Danaus go into Greece, before Cadmus went in search of Europa. Diodorus having related the story of Danaus, says, μικρον δ' ὑστερον τούτων των χρόνων, Καδμος, κ. τ. λ. “a short time afterwards, &c.” Diod. Sic. l. v. p. 329. Our chronologer places Cadmus 8 years before Danaus.

† *Ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς, ἐμὲ παρα[λί]αδι*, super littus, in maritimâ regione. It is very probable, that *παραλίαδι* is not the word, which was originally engraved on the marbles. *παραλίας* is an uncommon term; and, joined with *αὐτῆς*, in this place, occasions a tautology.

‡ Panathenæa, an Athenian festival in honour of the goddess Athena, or Minerva. Apollodorus and Harpocration tell us, that it was instituted by Erichthon; for which the latter produces the authority of Hellanicus and Androtion. He adds, on the testimony of Ister the historian, that, before the time of Erichthon, this festival was called Athenæa, and not Panathenæa. But Pausanias asserts, that it did not receive the name of Panathenæa, till Theseus formed the twelve cities of Attica into one community, and ordained a common feast and sacrifice for all the united Athenians.

## 26 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

a chariot, and shewed the contest \*, and changed the name of Athenæa ; and the image, of the mother of the gods appeared in [the mountains of] Cybele † ; and Hyagnis the Phrygian first invented flutes at Celænæ [a city] of Phrygia, and first played on the flute the harmony called Phrygian, and other nomes ‡ of the mother [of the gods] of Dionysus, of Pan, and that of the deities of the country, and the heroes, 1242 years, Erichthonius, who yoked [horses to] the chariot, reigning at Athens. - - -

Bef. Chr.

1506

11. Since Minos the first reigned and built Cydonia ; and iron was found in Ida, by the Idæi Dactyli Celmis and Dammaneus [1168] years, Pandion reigning at Athens. - - -

1433

12. Since Ceres coming to Athens planted corn ||, and first sent it to other [countries],  
by

Apollod. l. iii. c. 13. § 6. Plut. in v. Thesei, p. 11. Harpocration in v. Παναθηναία. Pausan. l. viii. c. 2. Schol. Aristoph. Nub. v. 385.

\* Primùm junxit quadrigas Erichthonius. Plin. l. vii. c. 55.

† Diod. Sic. l. iii. p. 193. ΑΠΟ ΤΩΝ ΚΥΒΕΛΩΝ ἡ ΚΥΒΕΛΗ, à Cybelis Cybele nominata. Strab. xii. p. 852.

‡ Νομος signifies a tune, or a piece of music ; and sometimes an ode or song. Νομῶ τιμὴ ἀδοντες, “ singing a particular tune.” Xenoph. Anab. l. v. Non antè cantare desistit, quàm incohatum absolveret νομον, “ he did not leave off, till he had finished the piece of music he had before him.” Suet. in v. Ner. § 20. Διεξελθεῖν νομον τοῦ Ὀρθίου, “ to sing the Orthian song.” Herod. l. i. c. 24. Aristotle proposes this problem, “ Why is the same word, νομος, used for laws and songs ? Is it,” says he, “ because men, before they had discovered the art of writing, sung their laws, that they might not forget them ?” Arist. Prob. sect. xix. 23. Vid. Plut. de Musicâ.

|| Καρπὸν ἐφύτευεν, planted fruit. Some writers suppose, that barley



by Triptolemus [the son] of Celeus and Neæra, 1145 years, Erichtheus reigning at Athens. - - - -	Bef. Chr.
13. Since Triptolemus sowed <i>corn</i> in Rharia, called Eleusin*, 1[1]42 years, <i>Erichtheus</i> reigning at Athens. - -	1409
14. Since <i>Orpheus</i> published his poem [on] the rape of Proserpine †, the search of Ceres, his <i>descent</i> [to the shades], and the fables concerning those, who received the corn †, 1135 years, Erichtheus reigning at Athens. - - - -	1406
15. Since <i>Eumolpus</i> [the son] of <i>Musæus</i> celebrated the mysteries in Eleusin, and published the poems of his father <i>Musæus</i> , 11 . . years, <i>Erichtheus</i> [the son] of Pandion, reigning at Athens. - - - -	1399
	13..

ley was the first grain sown in Attica. Pharnutus asserts, that Eleusis was the place, where the use of *barley* was first discovered. Phurn. de Nat. Deor. c. 23. Pausanias likewise observes, that corn was first sown in the Rharian plain; and that the cakes offered in sacrifice to Ceres, were made of the *barley*, which grew there. Pausan. l. i. c. 38. But Apollodorus, Diodorus, and others, when they speak of the first essays of agriculture, under the direction of Ceres, use the words *σιτος*, *πυρος*, and *καρπος*, indiscriminately, as well as *ουλαι*. Apollod. l. i. c. 5. § 2. Diod. Sic. l. v. p. 336.

\* Eleusin.—Talis est in Græcis ratio: nam *aëlin* et *aëlis* dicunt, *delphin* et *delphis*, *Eleusin* et *Eleusis*; sed veriùs in *n* desinunt, quòd in obliquis habent, et *aëlinos*, *delphinos*, *Eleusinos*. Serv. Virg. Georg. l. i. 161.

† A fragment, which is cited by Pausanias, and ascribed to Homer, mentions the names of those, who received the corn, and were first initiated into the mysteries of Ceres. These were, according to that poet, Celeus, Triptolemus, Eumolpus, and Diocles. Pausan. l. ii. c. 14. Clemens Alexandrinus says, their names were Baubo, Dyfaules, Triptolemus, Eumolpus, and Eubuleus. Clem. Alex. Cohort. § 2. p. 17.

## 28 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

16. Since a lustration was first performed by slaying . . . . . 10[6]2 years, Pandion [the son] of Cecrops [the second] reigning at Athens. - - -	Bef. Chr.
	1326
17. Since the gymnastic <i>agon</i> * was instituted in Eleusin, 1 . . . years, Pandion [the son] of Cecrops reigning at Athens. - - -	....
18. Since human sacrifices and the Lycæa were celebrated in Arcadia † and . . . . . of Lycæon were given among the Greeks, 1 . . . years, Pandion [the son] of Cecrops reigning at Athens. - - -	....
19. Since Hercules, having been purified ‡ in Eleusin, was initiated the first of strangers   , 1 . . . years, Ægeus reigning at Athens. - - -	....
20. Since a scarcity of corn happened at Athens, and Apollo being consulted by the Athenians obliged them to undergo the penalties, which Minos § should require, 1031 years, Ægeus reigning at Athens.	1295
21. Since	

\* *Agon*, contest, exercises or games.

† *Τα Λυκαία*, an Arcadian festival instituted by Lycæon, in honour of Jupiter, celebrated with games, and a human sacrifice. *Εθυσεν το βεβηκός*, immolavit infantem. Pausan. l. viii. c. 2.

‡ Hercules underwent a purgation for killing the centaur. Apollod. l. ii. c. 5. § 12.

|| *Ην δε ουκ εχον εσσις τοτε περαιθεαι*. At verò externis ad ea sacra tunc admitti non licebat. Apollod. *ibid*.

§ The author of the Chronicle supposes, that there were two kings of Crete of the name of Minos. See *Ερως*. 11. Abbé Bannier maintains the same opinion, and specifies several distinguishing circumstances in the history of these two princes. According to this hypothesis, the former was the celebrated legislator, a pacific monarch, the son of Jupiter, or rather of Atlas, and the father of Lycastus.

21. Since Theseus incorporated the twelve cities of Attica * into one [community] and having first established a civil constitution and a popular government † at Athens; he instituted the Isthmian games, after he had slain Sinis ‡, 995 years. - - -	Bef. Chr.
22 From the first [celebration of the festival called] Ammon, 992 years, Theseus reigning at Athens. - - -	1259
23. Since Adrastus reigned over the Argives, and the seven [commanders] instituted the games in Nemea, 987 years, Theseus reigning at Athens. - - -	1256
24. Since the Greeks undertook their expedition to Troy, 954 years, Menestheus reigning at Athens, in the thirteenth year [of his reign]. - - -	1251
25. Since Troy was taken, 945 years, Menestheus reigning at Athens, in the [twenty-]second    year [of his reign] on the	1218

Lycastus. The latter was of an ambitious and enterprising character; the grandson of the former, and the father of Molus, Deucalion, Androgeus, Glaucus, Phædra, and Ariadne. Banier, Mythol. vol. iii. p. 514. Diod. Sic. l. iv. p. 263.

\* The twelve cities of Attica were Cecropia, Tetrapolis, Epacria, Decalea, Eleusis, Aphydna, Thoricus, Brauron, Cytherus, Sphetus, Cephissia, and Phalerus. Theseus, it is said, collected them, εἰς μίαν πόλιν, into one city, which was Athens. Strab. l. ix. p. 609. Pausan. l. viii. c. 2. Ille vicatim dispersos cives suos, in unam urbem contraxit. Val. Max. l. v. c. 3.

† Πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ἰ. ε. πολιτείαν δημοκρατικὴν. Maittaire, Marm. Arund. p. 650.

‡ Plut. in v. Thesei, p. 4. Apollod. l. iii. c. 15. § 2.

|| The siege of Troy commenced in the thirteenth year of Menestheus; consequently the destruction of that city could not be in the

# 30 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

the twenty-fourth day of the month Thar-	Bef. Chr.
gelion. - - - -	1209
26. Since Orestes in Scythia was freed from his madness, and a cause between him and Erigone, the daughter of Ægisthus, concerning Ægisthus, was tried in Areopagus, which Orestes gained, the votes being equal, [942] years, Demophon reigning at Athens. - - - -	1206
27. Since Teucer built Salamis in Cyprus, 938 years, Demophon reigning at Athens. - - - -	1202
28. Since Neleus built * Miletus in Caria, having collected the Ionians, who built Ephesus, Erythræ, Clazomene, Priene, and Lebedus, Teos, Colophon, Myus, Phoea, Samos, Chios; and the Panionia † were instituted, [813] years, Medon reigning at Athens, in the thirteenth year [of his reign]. - -	1077
29. Since Hesiod the poet flourished 680 years, Megacles reigning at Athens. -	944

the second, as it is stated in the inscription. Quadratarîi incuriâ omissum est proculdubið heic εικοσου και, ita ut annus Menesthei vigesimus secundus ab autore signatus fuerit. Seld. p. 85.

\* Homer tells us, that Miletus was inhabited at the time of the Trojan war.

Οἱ Μιλητιον εχον ———

Qui Miletum tenebant. Il. ii. 868.

But Strabo, on the authority of Ephorus, informs us, that Neleus built a new city, at a distance from the old one, which he likewise called Miletus. Strab. l. xiv. p. 941.

† A festival, celebrated by a concourse of people from all the cities of Ionia.

30. Since



30. Since Homer the poet flourished 643 years, <i>Diognetus</i> reigning at Athens. -	Bef. Chr. 907
31. Since <i>Pheidon</i> the Argive was proscribed, and made <i>measures and weights</i> , and coined silver money in <i>Ægina</i> , being the eleventh from <i>Hercules</i> , 631 years, <i>Pherecles</i> reigning at Athens. -	895
32. Since <i>Archias</i> [the son] of <i>Euagetus</i> , being the tenth from <i>Temenus</i> , conducted a colony from <i>Corinth</i> to <i>Syracuse</i> , [494] years, <i>Æschylus</i> reigning at Athens, in the twenty-first year [of his reign]. -	758
33. Since <i>Creon</i> was archon for the year *, 420 years †. -	684
34. Since	

\* In this epocha the inscription is imperfect. Palmerius, Marsham, Prideaux, Maittaire, and Chandler, fill up the lacunæ in this manner : Αφ' οὗ κατ' ἐνιαυτον ηἰ[ξ]εν [ὁ κ]ε[ε]ων. But the author of the Chronicle never uses the prepositive article *ὁ* before proper names. Perhaps the original expression might have been, ηἰξεν ὁ ἀρχων, “ the archon governed.”

κατ' ἐνιαυτον generally signifies quotannis, singulis annis, annually, or year by year ; and, in this acceptation, it is improperly applied to an archon, who was in office only one year.

This phrase however, if the passage be not an interpolation, is used by Thucydides in the sense, in which it is employed by the author of the Chronicle. Themistocles, says that historian, persuaded the Athenians to finish the Piræus ; “ for it was begun before this, during that year, in which he himself was chief magistrate at Athens :” ὑπηρετο δ' αὐτοῦ προτέρων ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ἀρχῆς, ἢ κατ' ἐνιαυτον Ἀθηναίοις ηἰξε. Ejus enim pars ædificari prius est cœpta, quo tempore ipse, annum magistratum gerens, Athenis præfuit. Thucyd. l. i. § 93.

Dodwell endeavours to prove, that Themistocles was archon, and began the fortifications of the Piræus in the year 481, the year before the coming of Xerxes. But it cannot be proved by any good

† J. Per. 4031. bef. Chr. 633. Corsin.

## 32 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

34. Since <i>Tyrtæus</i> joined the army * of the Lacedæmonians [against the Messenians] 418 years, <i>Lyfias</i> † being archon at Athens. -	Bef. Chr. 682
35. Since <i>Terpander</i> [the son] of <i>Dercencus</i> the Lesbian, directed the flute-players to reform the nomes of the ancients, and changed the old music, 381 years, <i>Dropilus</i> ‡ being archon at Athens. - -	645
36. Since <i>Alyattes</i> reigned over the Lydians, [34]1 years, <i>Aristocles</i> being archon at Athens. - - -	605
37. Since <i>Sappho</i> sailed from Mitylene to Sicily, flying . . . . [328] years, <i>Critias</i>    the first being archon at Athens; the <i>Geomori</i> possessing the government in Syracuse. -	592
38. Since the <i>Amphietyones</i> obtained a victory, having taken <i>Cyrrha</i> §, and a gymnic agon	

good authority, that *Themistocles*, the celebrated commander, was ever the archon eponymus. Admitting, that he was an inferior magistrate, in some preceding year, we do not find, that the *Piræus* was fortified, till the year 477, when *Adimantus* was archon. *Diodorus*, *C. Nepos*, *Plutarch*, *Pausanias*, and several other writers, relate, that this work was undertaken AFTER the conclusion of the Persian war. *Diod.* l. xi. p. 32. *C. Nep.* in v. *Themist.* c. 6. *Plut.* in v. *Themist.* p. 121. *Pausan.* l. i. c. 2.

I am therefore inclined to think, that the foregoing passage in *Thucydides* is, as I have already intimated, an interpolation.

\* ΣΥΓΓΕΛΛΑΧΗΤΕΥ, cum Lacedæmoniis militavit.—*Tyrtæus*, a lame, crack-brained poet, was sent by the Athenians to command the Spartan army.

† *Lyfias* archon. *J. P.* 4033. bef. Chr. 681. *Corfin.*

‡ *Dropilus* archon. *J. P.* 4070. bef. Chr. 644. *Id.*

|| *Critias* archon. *J. P.* 4118. bef. Chr. 596.—In marmore 332 scribendum esse putaverim. *Id.*

§ *Cirha*, a town in Phocis, near the bay of Corinth. The inhabitants had wasted the territory of Delphi, and besieged the city, from

agon was celebrated, rewards being allotted out of the spoils, [3]27 years, Simon * being archon at Athens. - - -	Bef. Chr. 591
39. Since [the Pythian] games were again celebrated, in which the conqueror received a crown, 3[22] years, Damafias the second † being archon at Athens. - - -	586
40. Since comedies were carried in carts by the Icarians ‡, Sufarion being the inventor, and the first prize proposed was a basket of figs, and a small vessel of wine, 2... years, . . . . being archon at Athens. - - -	57.
41. Since Pisistratus became tyrant    at Athens,	

from a desire of seizing the riches, contained in the temple of Apollo. Plut. in v. Solonis, p. 83.

\* Simon five Simonides archon. J. P. 4124. bef. Chr. 590. Corfin.

† Damafias II. archon. J. P. 4129. bef. Chr. 585. Id.

‡ Icaria or Icarus, a little borough, or, as Bentley calls it, "a country parish," in Attica. Athen. l. ii. p. 40. Dissert. on Phal. § 8. p. 147.

|| The word τυραννος, tyrant, among the Greeks, signified a person, who had by any means acquired a sovereign authority in a republican state, though he afterwards exercised his authority with justice and virtue. This was the case of Pisistratus, Gelo, and his brother Hiero. Some were even raised to the dignity of tyrant, by a voluntary decree of the people. Plutarch mentions particularly Tynnondas thus elected by the Eubœans, and Pittacus by the Mitylenæans; and he adds, that the Athenians would have thus elected Solon. Plut. De his qui ferò, &c. p. 551. Id. in v. Solonis, p. 85.

The word τυραννις, or τυραννος, does not occur in the poems of Homer or Hesiod, and probably was not used in their time. It is employed in a favourable sense by Euripides, in the Supplices; by Aristophanes, who calls Jupiter, θεων τυραννος, Nub. act. i. sc. 6; by Sophocles, in Oedipus Tyrannus; by Plato, in his Αντιφασις, § 8; by Æschines, in the following passage: τρεῖς αὖτις προέβηται . . . τυραν-



## 34 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

Athens, 297 years, Comias * being archon at Athens. - - -	Bef. Chr. 561
42. Since Crœsus sent [ambassadors] out of Asia to Delphi, [2]92 years, Euthydemus being archon at Athens. - - -	556
43 Since Cyrus king of Persia took Sardes, and apprehended Crœsus, deceived by the Pythia, [285] years, Erxiclides † being archon at Athens. At this time lived Hipponax, the Iambic poet. - - -	549
44. Since Thespis the poet flourished, the first who exhibited ‡ tragedy, for which a goat	

νις, και ολιγαρχια, και δημοκρατια. Orat. in Ctesiph. init. and frequently by the Roman writers. See Virg. Æn. vi. 266. Hor. l. iii. od. 17.

\* Comias archon, J. P. 4154. bef. Chr. 560. Corfin.

† Erxiclides archon, J. P. 4166. bef. Chr. 548. Id.

‡ Εδιδάξε, docuit. Δραμα διδασκειν, signifies to publish, exhibit, or act a play. This phrase was applied to the poets, who wrote for the stage. Αστυδαμας δ' ο τραγωδιογραφος τοτε πρωτον εδιδιξεν. Sub hoc tempus Astydamas, tragœdiarum scriptor, primùm docere cœpit. Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 270. Θεσπις εδιδάξεν, Thespis docuit. Suidas. Σοφοκλης εδίδαξε δραματα, Sophocles docuit fabulas. Id. The authors themselves were called διδασκαλοι, teachers : ιδιως διδασκαλους λεγουσι τους ποιητας των διθυραμβων, η των κωμωδιων, η των τραγωδιων, peculiariter vocant διδασκαλους ipsos dithyramborum, aut comœdiarum, aut tragœdiarum poetas. Harpocration. Suidas. The Latin writers adopted this mode of expression. Livius, qui primus fabulam docuit. Cic. de Clar. Orat. § 72. Cum Thyestem fabulam docuisset, mortem obiit Ennius. Ibid. § 78. Cum Orestem fabulam doceret Euripides. Cic. Tusc. l. iv. § 63. Epist. ad Attic. l. vi. 1. De Senect. c. 14. Hor. de Art. Poet. ver. 288. A. Gell. l. xvii. 21. Casaubon gives the following reason for this phrase : “ Studiorum ea fuit quondam ratio, ut maxima eruditionis pars in dramaticorum poetarum, ac præsertim comicorum, lectione et intelligentiâ poneretur. Inde puriorem Hellenismum, inde notitiam eorum, quæ in republicâ erant gesta, inde vitam & mores pri-  
morum

goat was appointed as the prize, 2[73] years, Alcæus the first being archon at Athens *. -	Bef. Chr. 537
45. Since Darius † reigned over the Persians, Magus being dead, [2]5[6] years, . . . being archon at Athens. - -	520
46. Since Harmodius and Aristogiton slew Hipparchus [the son] of Pisistratus, the tyrant of Athens, and the Athenians conspired to expel the Pisistratidæ from [their retreat within] the Pelasgic wall, 248 years, Clisthenes ‡ being archon at Athens. - -	512
47. Since choruses of men first contended, [and] Hypodicus the Chalcidian, having taught    one [of them] gained the victory, 24[4] years, Isagoras being archon at Athens. - - - -	508
48. Since the temple of Minerva Hippias §	

morum civitatis Atheniensium hauriebant." Casaub. in Athen. l. vi. c. 7.

\* Alcæus I. archon. J. P. 4178. bef. Chr. 536. Corfin.

† Darius began his reign, J. P. 4193. bef. Chr. 521. Id. Petav. Doct. Temp. l. x. c. 19. Newt. Chron.

‡ Clisthenes archon. J. P. 4205. bef. Chr. 509. Corfin.

|| Διδαξας. Plut. in v. Themist. p. 114. vid. Epoc. 44. note †.—  
χοροδιδασκαλοι, qui choros docuerunt, nempe musices periti. Taylor, Com. ad Marm. Sandv. p. 72. Demosth. c. Midiam. p. 47. edit. 1743. Plut. in v. Arist. init.

§ Minerva equestris. Pausan. l. i. c. 30. Harpocraton. Suidas. The application of this mutilated passage to Minerva Hippias is ingenious; yet it is very probable, that it relates to Hippias, the brother of Pisistratus, who was expelled from Athens; and as some writers assert, was slain at the battle of Marathon. Cic. Epist. ad Attic. l. ix. 10. Just. l. ii. c. 9. Tertul. adv. Gentes, c. 46. Or, as others tell us, died afterwards in Lemnos. Suid. in v. Ἱππίας.—Vid. Herod. l. vi. § 107, 108. Thucyd. l. vi. §. 59.



## 36 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

*was built* at Athens, 231 years; Pythocritus \*  
being archon at Athens. - - - Bef. Chr.  
495

49. Since the battle at Marathon † was  
fought by the Athenians against the Per-  
sians, and the Athenians defeated *Artā-*  
*phernes*, the nephew ‡ of Darius, the com-  
mander [of the Persian forces], 227 years,  
*Phænippus* || the second being archon at A-  
thens; and *Æschylus* the poet was engaged  
in the action, being [then] 35 years [of  
age]. - - - 491

50. Since Simonides, the grandfather of  
Simonides the poet, *he* also being a poet,  
[dies] at Athens; and Darius dies, and  
Xerxes *his* son reigns, [226] years, Aristi-  
des § being archon at Athens. - 490

51. Since *Æschylus* the poet first gained  
the victory in tragedy, and Euripides the  
poet was born, and Stesichorus the poet *went*  
*into* Greece, 222 years, Philocrates ¶ being  
archon at Athens. - - - 486

52. Since Xerxes formed a bridge of  
boats on the Helle'spont, and cut [a naviga-  
ble canal] through Athos, and the battle was  
fought in Thermopylæ, and the sea-fight by  
the Greeks at Salamis, against the Persians,

\* Pythocritus archon. J. P. 4220. bef. Chr. 494. Corfin.

† Corfini places the battle at Marathon in the year bef. Chr.  
490. Quum Salaminia pugna die 20 Boëdromionis, anno 1.  
Olymp. LXXV. contigerit, Marathonica clades 6 ejusdem Boëdromi-  
onis mensis diei anni 3 Olymp. LXXII. certissimè ascribi debet.  
Corfini Fast. Attic. vol. iii. p. 150.

‡ Ἀδελφίδεον. Herod. l. vi. §. 94.

|| Phænippus archon. J. P. 4224. bef. Chr. 490. Corfin.

§ Aristides archon. J. P. 4225. bef. Chr. 489. Id.

¶ Philocrates archon. J. P. 4229. bef. Chr. 485. Id.

# THE PARIAN CHRONICLE. 37

in which the Greeks were victorious, 217 years, Calliades \* being archon at Athens. -

Bef. Chr.

481

53. Since the battle at Plataeæ was fought by the Athenians against Mardōniūs, Xerxes's general; in which the Athenians conquered, and Mardōnius fell in the battle; and [torrents of liquid] fire flowed in Sicily round Ætna; [2]16 years, Xanthippus † being archon at Athens. -

480

54. Since Gelon [the son] of Dinomenes became tyrant of Syracuse, 215 years, Timosthenes ‡ being archon at Athens. -

479

55. Since Simonides [the son] of Leoprepes, the Cean, who invented the art of memory ||, teaching [a chorus] at Athens, gained the victory §; and the statues of Harmodius and Aristogiton were erected, 2[14] years, Adimantus ¶ being archon at Athens. -

478

56. Since Hiero became tyrant of Syra-

\* Calliades archon. J. P. 4234. bef. Chr. 480. Corfin.

† Xanthippus archon. J. P. 4235. bef. Chr. 479. Id.

‡ Timosthenes archon. J. P. 4236. bef. Chr. 478. Id.

|| Simonidem primum ferunt artem memoriæ protulisse. Cic. de Orat. l. ii. § 84. Artem memoriæ primus ostendisse dicitur Simonides. Quint. l. xi. c. 2. Plin. l. vii. c. 24.

§ ΕΥΚΗΣΕΝ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΔΙΚΑΣΤΩΝ. Bentley thinks, these words relate to the teaching of a chorus, and translates the passage in this manner: "Simonides, the son of Leoprepes the Cean, that found the art of memory, got the prize at Athens, as teacher of a chorus, when Adimantus was archon." Dissert. on Phal. p. 29, 30.

Plutarch mentions a victory, which Simonides obtained by teaching a chorus: ΕΙΠΕ ΣΙΜΩΝΙΔΗΣ ΜΕΝ ΕΝ ΤΗΣΣΑ ΧΟΡΟΙΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΑ. Siquidem senex Simonides choris victoriam reportavit. Plut. Anf. eni, &c. p. 785. Val. Max. l. viii. c. 7. § 13.

¶ Adimantus archon. J. P. 4237. bef. Chr. 477. Corfin.

cuse,

## 38 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

cuse, 20[9] years, Chares * being archon at Athens : Epicharmus the poet lived at this time. - - - - -	Bef. Chr.
57. Since Sophocles [the son] of Sophilus, who was of Colonus †, gained the victory in tragedy, being 28 years of age, 206 years, Apsephion ‡ being archon at Athens. - - - - -	473
58. Since the stone fell in Ægos-potamos, and Simonides the poet died, having lived 90 years, 205 years, Theagenidas § being archon at Athens. - - - - -	470
59. Since Alexander died, and his son Perdiccas reigns over the Macedonians, 19[8] years, Euthippus § being archon at Athens. - - - - -	469
60. Since Æschylus the poet, having lived 69 years, died at Gela, in Sicily, 193 years, Callias the first ¶ being archon at Athens. - - - - -	462
61. Since Euripides, being 43 years of age, first gained the victory in tragedy, 1[79] years, Diphilus ** being archon at Athens. Socrates and Anaxagoras lived in the time of Euripides. - - - - -	457
62. Since Archelaus reigned over the Macedonians, Perdiccas being dead, 1[56] years, Aftyphilus being archon at Athens. - - - - -	443
	420

\* Chares archon. J. P. 4242. bef. Chr. 472. Corfin.

† Colonus, about ten stadia from Athens. Thucyd. l. viii. §

67. Cic. de Fin. l. v. c. 1.

‡ Apsephion archon. J. P. 4245. bef. Chr. 469. Corfin.

§ Theagenides archon. J. P. 4246. bef. Chr. 468. Id.

§ Euthippus archon. J. P. 4253. bef. Chr. 461. Id.

¶ Callias I. archon. J. P. 4258. bef. Chr. 456. Id.

\*\* Diphilus archon. J. P. 4272. bef. Chr. 442. Id.

63. Since



# THE PARIAN CHRONICLE. 39

63. Since Dionysius became tyrant of Syracuse, 144 years, Euctemon being archon at Athens. - - - -	Bef. Chr.
	408
64. Since Euripides, having lived <i>seventy-seven years</i> , died, 14[3] years, Antigenes being archon at Athens. - -	407
65. Since Sophocles the poet, having lived <i>ninety-one years</i> , died; and Cyrus went up [into Persia] <i>against his brother*</i> , 142 years, Callias the first † being archon at Athens. -	406
66. Since Telestes ‡ the Selinuntian gained the prize at Athens, 13[8] years, Micon being archon at Athens. - -	402
67. Since <i>those returned</i> , who went up with Cyrus [into Persia] and Socrates the philosopher died, <i>having lived 70 years</i> , 13[6] years, Laches being archon at Athens. -	400
68. Since Astydamas first taught at Athens, 135 years, Aristocrates being archon at Athens. - - -	399
69. Since Xanthus, a poet of Sardes, gained the victory at Athens in dithyrambics, 1 . . years, . . . being archon at Athens. -	...
70 Since Philoxenus, a writer of dithy-	

\* ΚΥΡΟΣ ΑΝΕΒ[ΗΣΕ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΝ]. These four letters, *ανεβ...* apparently refer to the celebrated *Anabasis* of the younger Cyrus.

ΑΝΕΒΗΣΕ ΟΙ ΑΝΑΒΑΝΤΕΣ, επος. 67. is a form of expression very common among the Greek writers, when they speak of going up to a metropolis. ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΡΩΜΗΝ ΑΝΑΒΑΙΝΟΥΣΙ. Jos. Antiq. l. xx. 7. ΑΝΕΒΑΣΑΝ ΕΣ ΣΟΥΣΑ. Herod. l. vii. § 136. Vid. Math. xx. 17, 18. Mark, x. 32, 33. Luke, x. 30. John, v. 1. vii. 8. ΚΥΡΟΥ ΑΝΑΒΑΣΙΣ. Xenoph. ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΑΝΑΒΑΣΙΣ. Arrian.

† Του πρ. τ. ου should rather be του δευτερου, the second. Corfin. Fast. Artic. vol. iii. p. 260.

‡ Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 273.



## 40 THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

rambics, dies, having lived 55 years, 116 years, Pytheas being archon at Athens. -	Bef. Chr. 380
71. Since Anaxandrides the comic poet gained the victory at Athens, [113] years, Calleeas being archon at Athens. -	377
72. Since Aftydamas gained the victory at Athens, 109 years, Asteius being archon at Athens. Then also a great light * blazed in the sky. -	373
73. Since the battle was fought at Leuctra between the Thebans and the Lacedæmonians, in which the Thebans conquered, 107 years, Phrasiclides being archon at Athens. At this time Alexander [the son] of Amyntas reigns over the Macedonians. -	371
74 Since Stefichorus, the Himerian, the second [of that name] gained the victory at Athens, and Megalopolis in Arcadia was built, [106] years, Dyscinetus being archon at Athens. -	370
75. Since Dionysius the Sicilian died, and his son Dionysius became tyrant, and Alexander being dead, Ptolemy reigns over the	

\* Ἡ μεγάλη λαμπράς.—This phenomenon is mentioned by Diodorus Siculus; but is said to have happened the year afterwards, Olymp. CII. 1. bef. Chr. 372. Ωφθη μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπὶ πολλὰς νυκτὰς λαμπράς μεγάλη καίομενη, ἀπὸ τοῦ σχήματος ὀνομασθεῖσα πυρρὴν δοκίς. Ingens enim fax in cœlo multis noctibus ardens apparuit, quæ propter figuram ignea trabs appellata fuit. Diod. Sic. l. xv. p. 365. Aristotle tells us, that in the archonship of Aristæus, μεγάλη αἴσα, magna stella apparuit. Meteor. l. i. c. 6. Corfini thinks, that Aristæus should be Asteius; and that the author of the Chronicle, Diodorus, and Aristotle allude to the same phenomenon. The δοκίς πυρρὴν, ignea trabs, or fiery beam, was undoubtedly the tail of a comet.

Macedonians,

<i>Macedonians</i> , 104 years, Naufigenes being archon at Athens. - - -	Euf. Chr. 368
76. Since the Phocæans <i>plundered the temple</i> of Delphi, [94] years, Cephisodorus being archon at Athens. - - -	358
77. Since Timotheus, having lived 90 years, died, and <i>Philip</i> [the son] of <i>Amyntas</i> reigns over the <i>Macedonians</i> , and Artaxerxes died; and Ochus his son reigns over the <i>Persians</i> , and . . . . . gained the victory, 93 years, Agathocles being archon at Athens. - - -	357
78. Since <i>Alexander</i> [the son] of <i>Philip</i> was born*, 91 years, Callistratus being archon at Athens: <i>Aristotle</i> the philosopher lived at that time. - - -	355
79. Since Calippus, having slain <i>Dion</i> , became tyrant of <i>Syracuse</i> , [90] years, Diotimus being archon at Athens. - - -	354

\* \* \* \* \*

\* Plutarch, Justin, and other writers, inform us, that Alexander was born at the time of the celebration of the Olympic games. The birth of Alexander therefore should have been placed in the preceding year, namely, the first year of the CVI Olympiad. Plut. in. v. Alex. p. 666. Just. l. xii. c. 16. Eusebius is guilty of the same error. Chron. p. 136.

---

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

PARIAN CHRONICLE.

---

CHAP. I.

THE Parian Chronicle, engraved on a marble tablet of considerable extent, is supposed to have been written 264 years before the Christian æra \*. In its perfect state, it contained a chronological detail of the principal events of Greece, during a period of 1318

\* Bef. Chr. 263 years, according to Selden, Prideaux, &c.—An. J. P. 4450, bef. Chr. 264, according to Corsini and Taylor. Fasti Attici, tom. iv. p. 88. Marm. Sandv. p. 5.—In the fourth year of the CXXVIII Olympiad, bef. Chr. 265 or 264, according to Sir Isaac Newton. Chron. p. 47.

All the dates in this Dissertation refer to the commencement of the Christian æra, according to the COMMON computation. But it must be observed, that, in many cases, it is difficult, if not impossible, to adjust the Olympic year to the year before Christ; because the former began *πρὸς τὰς ἑπομένας θερινὰς*, about the summer solstice, and comprehended part of two Julian years.

years, beginning with Cecrops, before Christ 1582 years, and ending with the archonship of Diognetus, bef. Chr. 264. But the chronicle of the last ninety years is lost; so that the part now remaining ends at the archonship of Diotimus, 354 years before the birth of Christ; and in this fragment the inscription is at present so much corroded and effaced, that the sense can only be discovered by very learned and industrious antiquaries, or, more properly speaking, supplied by their CONJECTURES.

The date of the Chronicle coincides with the twenty-first year of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt, the splendid age of the Poëtarum Pleias\*; of Lycophron, Theocritus, Callimachus, Aratus, &c. the reign in which chronologers usually place the Seventy Interpreters †, Pseudo-Aristeas, Manetho, and others.

The Chronicle, which is the subject of this enquiry,

\* Authors are not agreed about the names of these poets. The scholiast to Hephæstion makes this poetical constellation consist of the following tragic writers: Homerus the son of Myro, Sositheus, Lycophron, Alexander Ætolus, Æantides, Sosisphanes, and Philiscus or Philicus. Hephæst. Schol. p. 93. edit. 1553. Their names are mentioned again, with some variation, *ibid.* p. 32. Tzetzes includes in the list of these poets Lycophron, Theocritus, Aratus, Nicander, Æantides or Apollonius Rhodius, Philicus, and Homerus tragicus. Tzetzes de Gen. Lycoph. edit. 1601.

Saxius and others place the Poëtarum Pleias in the year bef. Chr. 277; yet it is certain, that all the poets above mentioned did not flourish at the same time. Gerald. Dial. iii. p. 330. Voss. de Poet. Græc. c. 8. p. 64. Id. de Hist. Græc. l. ii. c. 12. p. 74. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. ii. c. 19. vol. i. p. 688.

† Bef. Chr. 277. Prid. Connect. vol. iii. p. 38. The history of the translation of the Bible by the seventy-two elders, as related by Aristeas, is A CONTEMPTIBLE FICTION. Prideaux says: "No Aristeas, or heathen Greek, but some Hellenistical Jew, under his name, was the author of that book." *Ibid.* p. 50. Hodus de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i.

and



and many other relics of antiquity, were" purchased in Asia Minor, in Greece, or in the islands of the Archipelago, by Mr. William Petty, who in the year 1624 \* was sent by the Earl of Arundel †, for the purpose of making such collections for him in the East. They were brought into England about the beginning of the year 1627, and placed in the gardens belonging to Arundel-house in London, the site of which is now occupied by Arundel, Norfolk, Surrey, and Howard Streets, in the Strand.

Soon after their arrival they excited a general curiosity, and were viewed by many inquisitive and learned men; among others, by Sir Robert Cotton, who went immediately to Selden, and entreated him to exert his

\* "I heare your grace hath written by one Mr. Petty, that is arrived at Smirna, ymployed by my lord of Arundell to buy books and antiquities." Letter from Sir T. Roe to archbishop Abbot, Dec. 9-19, 1624. Roe's Negot. Let. 229. p. 320.

† THOMAS, the son of Philip Howard, earl of Arundel, was born in 1592. In 1603, he was restored to all the titles of honour, which his father lost by his attainder; and also to the dignity of earl of Surrey, &c. In 1613, he went into Italy; but returned the next year. In 1621, he was constituted earl marshal of England. In 1627, he obtained the Parian marbles, which were sent by Mr. Petty. In Feb. 1641-2, he embarked for Italy. In 1644, he was created earl of Norfolk. He died at Padua, Oct. 4, 1646. This excellent nobleman was a great favourer of arts and learning. His designs, paintings, statues, &c. were numerous and valuable, and collected, at a great expence, from various parts of Europe and Asia.

He was succeeded in his estate and honours by his son HENRY Howard, who died 1652, and left nine sons, THOMAS, HENRY, Philip, Charles, Talbot, Bernard, Esme; and three daughters. Thomas was restored to the title of duke of Norfolk in 1664. Afterwards traveling into Italy, he died at Padua, unmarried, Dec. 1, 1677, whereby his honours and estate descended to his brother HENRY; of whom a farther account will be given in a subsequent note.

## 46 A DISSERTATION ON

abilities in explaining the Greek inscriptions. Selden readily complied with his request; but desired the assistance of their common friends, Patrick Young, or, as he styled himself in Latin, Patricius Junius, and Richard James \*.

The next morning, these gentlemen met in Arundel-gardens, and commenced their operations, by cleaning and examining the marble, containing the league, which the cities of Smyrna and Magnesia entered into, in favour of Seleucus Callinicus, king of Syria. Afterwards, they proceeded to the Parian Chronicle, and other inscriptions.

The following year Selden published a small volume in quarto, including twenty-nine Greek, and ten Latin inscriptions, copied from the marbles, with a translation and a commentary, under this title :

*Marmora Arundelliana ; five saxa Græcè incisa, ex venerandis priscae Orientis gloriæ rudibus, auspiciis et impensis herois illustrissimi, Thomæ, comitis Arundelliae et Surriæ, comitis marescalli Angliæ, pridem vindicata, & in ædibus ejus hortisque cognominibus, ad Thamesis ripam, disposita.*

\* Patrick Young was librarian to James the First, and Charles the First. He was a man of distinguished learning; and, among other things, published,

*Clementis ad Corinthios Epistola prior, Gr. et Lat. cum interpretatione & notis, 4to. Oxon. 1633; and, in the same volume, Fragmentum Epistolæ secundæ, Græcè.*

*Catena Græcorum Patrum in Jobum, Gr. & Lat. fol. Lond. 1637.*

He died in 1652, in the sixty-ninth year of his age.

Richard James was born at Newport, in the Isle of Wight, and was fellow of Corpus Christi College, in Oxford. In 1636, he published an English translation of Minucius Felix, which he dedicated “to Lady Cotton, wife of Sir Robert Cotton, of Conington.” He was likewise the author of several sermons, &c. He died, Dec. 7, 1638.

Accedunt

Accedunt inscriptiones aliquot veteris Latii, ex locupletissimo ejusdem vetustatis thesauro selectæ : Auc-  
tariolum item aliundè sumtum.

Publicavit et commentariolos adjecit  
Joannes Seldenus, J. C.

“ Ipso rore mihi seges est, quo gramen onagris.”

*Prudent. [in Sym. v. 812.]*

Londini, typis & impensis Guilielmi Stanesbeii, MDC  
XXVIII. Some copies have, Apud Johannem  
Billium typographum, MDCXXIX.

In the turbulent reign of Charles the First, and the subsequent usurpation, Arundel-house was often deserted by the illustrious owners ; and, in their absence, some of the marbles, which were deposited in the gardens, were defaced or broken ; and others either stolen, or used for the ordinary purposes of architecture \*.

This appears to have been the fate of the collection in general. With respect to the chronological marble, we find, that during the civil wars, it was most unfortunately broken and defaced. The upper part, containing almost half of the inscription, is said to have been worked up in repairing a chimney in Arundel-house. But a copy of it has been luckily preserved by Selden. The fragment now remaining begins with these words : ———ΕΘΚΕΥΑΣΕ, ΚΑΙ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑ. l. 46. epoc. 31.

In the year 1667, the Hon. Henry Howard †, grand-  
son

\* Hæc tamen vix ultra dimidiam partem eorum conficiunt, quæ insignissimus Arundelliae comes collegerat ; cætera, cùm tempore nuperrimi belli civilis incendii, in hortis Arundellianis Londini, pulsus inde dominis, diu neglecta jacuerint, aut furum surrepta, aut fervorum negligentia corrupta, aut à lapicidis ad reficiendas aedes adhibita, in magnum rei literarie damnum, amittuntur. *Prid. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. ix.*

† HENRY HOWARD was the second son of Henry earl of Arundel above mentioned. He was born in 1623. In 1664, he set out



son of the first collector, on the application of John Evelyn, Esq. presented these curious remains of antiquity to the university of Oxford.

At that time Selden's work was become scarce \*. It was therefore thought necessary, that another edition of the inscriptions should be published. Accordingly, bishop Fell † engaged Mr. Prideaux in this important work. Prideaux, though he had not then been six years at the university ‡, acquitted himself with great reputation. His edition was printed at Oxford in 1676, under the following title :

*Marmora Oxoniensia, ex Arundellianis, Seldenianis, aliisque conflata, recensuit, et perpetuo commentario explicavit, Humphridus Prideaux, Ædis Christi alumnus, appositis ad eorum nonnulla Seldeni & Lydiati annotationibus. Accessit Sertorii Ursati Patavini de Notis Romanorum Commentarius. Oxonii, è Theatro Sheldoniano. MDCLXXVI. folio.*

In 1721, Dr. Prideaux being then advanced in years ||, and unable to superintend the republication of his own work, Mr. Robert Pearse, of Edmund Hall, in Oxford,

for Constantinople, and returned in 1665. In 1667, he presented the marbles to the university of Oxford. In 1668, he was created LL.D. In 1669, he was advanced to the dignity of baron, by the title of lord Howard of Castle Rising. In 1672, he was created earl of Norwich, and earl marshal. Upon the death of his elder brother Thomas, in 1677, he became duke of Norfolk. His Grace died at his house in Arundel-street, Jan. 11, 1683-4. Collins's Peerage.

\* Selden died, Nov. 30, 1654, aged 70.

† Optimus igitur Fellus noster Humphredo Prideaux, A. B. et Ædis Christi alumno, demandandum voluit. Chand. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. iii.

‡ Qui nondum tum sextum annum in his musarum scholis compleram. Prid. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. x.

|| Dean Prideaux died in 1724, aged 76.

proposed



proposed to reprint it, and obtained the author's permission to make what corrections in it he might think necessary. But Mr. Pearse never carried his scheme into execution.

In 1726, Dr. David Wilkins, who the same year \* had published the works of Mr. Selden, promised to give a new edition of the Arundelian inscriptions. In the mean time, some other engagements engrossed his attention, and he likewise relinquished his design.

In 1732, Mr. Maittaire obliged the public with a more comprehensive view of the Marbles, than either of his predecessors, in a work, entitled,

*Marmorum Arundellianorum, Seldenianorum, aliorumque Academiae Oxoniensi donatorum, cum variis commentariis et indice, secunda editio. Londini, typis Gulielmi Bowyer. MDCCXXXII. folio.*

In this publication the editor has given, First, the Greek and Latin inscriptions in capitals, and four inscriptions in Hebrew; then the Greek text in small letters, with a Latin translation by Selden, Prideaux, and Price, p. 1. to 99.

Secondly, the dissertations and comments of learned men separately, and at full length: namely,

1. Selden commentary, from p. 99 to 197.
2. Price's notes on the third marble [*Marmor Cretense*] p. 197—200.
3. Palmerius's notes and supplements to the first marble [*the Parian Chronicle*] p. 200—222.
4. Lydiat's annotations on the same. p. 222—295.
5. Marsham's commentaries on the first 58 epochas of the same marble. p. 295—309.
6. Prideaux's commentary on the marbles. p. 309—509.

\* This edition of Selden's works, in three volumes folio, was begun in 1722, and finished in 1726.

7. Some notes on the marbles by Reinesius. p. 509—524.
  8. Spon's notes on some of the marbles. p. 524—527.
  9. Chishull's notes on the third marble. p. 527—532.
  10. Extracts from Smith's Epistle concerning the Seven Churches of Asia. p. 532—533.
  11. Extracts from Bentley's Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris. p. 533—540.
  12. Maffei's Italian version of the first and second marbles, with notes. p. 540—549. [The second marble contains the Smyranean and Magnesian league.]
  13. Dodwell's chronological tables of the first marble. p. 549—553.
  14. Conjectures and remarks on the marbles and the preceding comments, by the editor. p. 553—605.
- Lastly, A copious index, interspersed with many critical notes and observations.

Mr. Prideaux, in his edition, had ranged the inscriptions in the order, in which the marbles were placed, while they stood in the court-yard belonging to Sheldon's Theatre\*. But as they were afterwards removed to a more convenient situation †, Maittaire reduced them, as nearly as he could, to the order observed by Gruter and others, who have arranged such ancient monuments, according to the nature and importance of their respective subjects.

In 1763, after the university had acquired a great variety of other ancient marbles, by the benefactions of Sir

\* Delata sunt Oxonium, in plateâ Theatri Sheldoniani deposita, vel muro qui eam ambit infixæ, & initiali literâ Howardiani nominis notatæ. Chand. Marm. Oxon. præf. p. iii.

† They are now carefully preserved in a room, adjoining to the public schools at Oxford, called the Museum Arundelianum.

## THE PARIAN CHRONICLE. 51

George Wheler, the Countess of Pomfret in the year 1755, Mr. Dawkins, Dr. Rawlinson, and others, Dr. Chandler undertook to give the public a new and improved copy of these valuable remains of antiquity; and accordingly published a very magnificent volume, entitled, *MARMORA OXONIENSIA*.

This work is divided into three parts. The first consists of 59 copper-plates, representing 167 statues, busts, urns, vases, altars, &c. without inscriptions.

The second contains 100 Egyptian, Palmyrene, Greek, and other inscriptions, and eleven plates.

The third consists of 145 inscriptions in Latin, Arabic, and other languages, and six plates.

To the whole is subjoined a verbal index.

This learned and ingenious editor has corrected the mistakes of his predecessors; and in some of the inscriptions, particularly that of the Parian Chronicle, has supplied the lacunæ by many happy CONJECTURES.

## C H A P. II.

**I**T seemed necessary to premise a general account of the marbles, that the reader may the more easily comprehend the following observations.

The DOUBTS, which have sometimes occurred to me, with respect to the authenticity of the Parian Chronicle, arise from the following considerations :

- I. The characters have no certain or unequivocal marks of antiquity.
  - II. It is not probable, that the Chronicle was engraved for PRIVATE USE.
  - III. It does not appear to have been engraved by PUBLIC AUTHORITY.
  - IV. The Greek and Roman writers, for a long time after the date of this work, complain, that they had no chronological account of the affairs of ancient Greece.
  - V. This Chronicle is not once mentioned by any writer of antiquity.
  - VI. Some of the facts seem to have been taken from authors of a later date.
  - VII. Parachronisms appear in some of the epochas, which we can scarcely suppose a Greek chronologer, in the cxxix Olympiad, would be liable to commit.
  - VIII. The history of the discovery of the marbles is obscure and unsatisfactory.
- Lastly, The literary world has been frequently imposed upon, by spurious books and inscriptions ; and therefore we should be extremely cautious, with re-  
gard



gard to what we receive under the venerable name of antiquity.

I. The characters in this inscription have no certain or unequivocal marks of antiquity.

It is written, like other ancient inscriptions, in capitals, without any distances between the words, and without any points or accents.

Selden informs us, that all the letters, except Π and Ζ, are EXACTLY represented by the common Greek types; that the *Pi* has the perpendicular line, on the right hand, only half as long as the parallel line on the left, thus, Π; and the *Zeta*, the form of a prostrate H, in this manner, Ζ\*.

It is generally supposed, that this was the more ancient way of writing the *Zeta* †; and that afterwards the

\* Non licuit per operarum formas, omnes archetyporum figuras ubique repræsentare; quod tamen plerumque in universis, sed in prioribus binis EXACTE, fecimus, EXCEPTIS TANTUMMODO Π et Ζ. Το π tum in chronologico hōc Marmore, tum in Smyrnæorum Decretis et Fœdere, perpetuò, crus, quod ad dextram vergit, habet dimidiatum ad hunc modum π. In recentioribus inscriptionibus quas dedimus, utrumque crus æquè semper extenditur; et Ζητα etiam non aliter quàm usitatis typographorum formis exaratur. In vetustioribus autem hīsce binis Ζητα hâc semper figurâ ζ occurrit, quæ ητα ἡπτικῶν, sive eta supinum, dicitur Alypio. Seld. Marm. Arund. p. 76.

† Vetus ejus figura ζ paulatim in z deflexa est. Chishul. Antiq. Asiatic. p. 20.

ππ. Hâc utrâque formâ PASSIM scribitur, ut videre est in alphabeto Cyziceni marmoris. [Montf. Palæog. Græc. p. 144.] Prior forma π, decurtatâ postremâ lineâ, vetustior est; unde factum P Latinum, mutando quadrata rotundis. Ibid. p. 142.—ππ prima forma prisca est: secunda item in marmoribus vetustissimis PASSIM habetur. Ibid. p. 337.

z. Sic incisum habetur in nummis & marmoribus; sed hâc formâ etiam NON INFREQUENTER observes ζ, quo pacto scribitur in Cyziceno marmore. Ibid. p. 142.

middle bar was drawn diagonally from the extremity of the upper line on the right hand, to the end of the lower line on the left, as it now stands in our modern alphabets.

Yet these two characters,  $\Pi$  and  $\Xi$ , so frequently occur, and are so well known, that any modern fabricator of a Greek inscription, which he intends to impose upon the world, as a relic of antiquity, would most probably use them, in preference to the more common and ordinary forms.

It is however observable, that the letters in the Parian Chronicle have no appearance of antiquity, except this very equivocal one.

They do not in the least resemble the Sigeian \*, the Nemean †, or the Delian ‡ inscriptions, which are supposed

\* See a copy of the Sigeian inscription in Chishull's *Antiquitates Asiaticæ*, p. 4.—This celebrated inscription is on part of an ancient pilaster, eight feet seven inches long, something more than eighteen inches wide, and a little above ten inches thick. It was intended to record the donations, which one Phanodicus of Proconnesus had made to a temple at Sigeum. The stone, at present, is used as a seat at the door of a Greek church, in a little village called Giaurkioi, in a place, where the city Sigeum formerly stood, three miles from the Sigeian promontory. The inscription is written in the manner, which the Greeks called *boustrophedon*; that is, the lines turn on the marble, as *oxen turn* in plowing, *from the left* to the right, and from the right to the left, alternately. The retrograde order of the letters is a relic of the oriental way of writing. This inscription is supposed to have been engraved about 560 years before the vulgar æra. Chandler's *Trav. in Asia Minor*, ch. xii.

† The Nemean inscription may be seen in the *Theaurus Inscriptionum*, collected by Muratori, and illustrated by M. Bimard, who supposes it to be next in antiquity to the Sigeian.

‡ The Delian inscription was brought from the East by M. Tournefort, who copied it from the base of a statue, supposed to be that of Apollo, thrown down in the isle of Delos. It consists of about

posed to be of a more ancient date. They differ, in many respects, from the letters on the Marmor Sandvicense \*, which, according to the learned editor of that inscription, was engraved in the year before Christ 374. They bear no sort of resemblance to the characters on the Farnesian pillars †, to those of the Alexandrian manuscript, or others of a later date. They seem to resemble, perhaps more than any other, the letters of the alphabet, taken by Montfaucon from the Marmor Cyzicenum, at Venice ‡. They are plain and simple in

about eight words, in uncouth letters, which, Montfaucon thinks, were the ancient Ionian characters. Tournef. Voyages, let. 7. Chish. Antiq. Asiat. p. 16. Montf. Palæog. Græc. l. ii. c. 1. p. 122.

\* The Marmor Sandvicense was found at Athens, and brought to England by lord Sandwich, in 1739. The inscription contains an account of the public money, collected for the festival of Apollo at Delphi, for four years, by the Amphictyones. The letters are placed at equal distances; and each letter of every subsequent line stands exactly under each letter of the preceding line; consequently, all the lines contain the same number of letters. In this position, the letters, with the interstices, appear like small perpendicular columns, extending from the bottom to the top of the marble. Marmor Sandvicense, cum commentario & notis J. Taylors, LL.D. 4to. 1743.

† Two columns found on the Appian road, about three miles from Rome, and removed from thence to the Farnesian palace. They are supposed to have been erected by Herodes Atticus, at his villa Triopia. Herodes was a scholar, and an admirer of antiquities. He was consul at Rome in the year 143.

“Part of the inscription is on one pillar, and part on the other.” It is intended to exhibit a specimen of the old Ionic letters; but seems to be a mere “*simia vetustatis*,” and is perhaps a forgery. Montf. Palæog. Græc. p. 135. 140. Scal. Animadv. in Euseb. p. 110. Salmas. Duarum Inscript. Explic. p. 29. See Letters from a Young Painter, let. 22. 51.

‡ Montf. Palæog. Græc. l. ii. c. 4. p. 144.—Montfaucon thinks, that this inscription must have been engraved before the time of Alexander the Great.

their



their form, and such as an ordinary stone-cutter of the present age would probably make, if he were employed to engrave a Greek inscription, according to the alphabet now in use. The small letters, intermixed among the larger, have an air of affectation and artifice, rather than genuine antiquity\*.

For my own part, I am persuaded, that the antiquity of an inscription can never be proved by the mere form of the letters; because the most ancient characters may be as easily counterfeited, as those, which now compose our present alphabets.

That the learned reader may form a competent idea of the characters in the Parian Chronicle, a small specimen, accurately copied from a plate in the *Marmora Oxoniensia*, published by Dr. Chandler, is annexed to this Dissertation.

It may be said, that there are several archaisms in this Chronicle, which are evident marks of antiquity: as,

Εγ instead of εκ.

εγ Λυκωρείας, è Lycoriâ. l. 7.

εγ Μιτυλήνης, è Mitylene. l. 51.

Εγ instead of εν.

εγ Κυβελούς, in Cybelis. l. 19.

εγ Κελαινάις, in Celænis. *ibid.*

Εμ instead of εν.

εμ Παρό, in Paro. l. 2.

εμ παρα . . αδι, in *maritimâ regione*. l. 17.

εμ Μαραθώνι, in Marathone. l. 62.

Λμ instead of αν.

ὡς αμ Μινως αἰώσσει, *quascunque Minos postulare*.  
l. 34.

\* But see Montf. *Palaëogr. Græc.* l. ii. c. 4. p. 142.



*Specimen literarum, quibus*  
*excavatatum est* CHRONICON MARMOREUM, *(ex) editionis*  
*Chandlerianae parte secunda. Tab. VIII. p. 104.*

---

ΕΛΛΗΣΠΟΝΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΝ ΑΘΩ ΔΙΩΡΥΞΕ ΚΑΙ Η ΕΝ ΘΕΡΜΟ-

Ἑλλησποντῷ, καὶ τὸν Αἰθῶ διωρυξε, καὶ ἡ ἐν Θερμο-

*In Hellesponto, et Athonem perfodit,*

*et in Thermopylis. Lin. 66. epoc. 52.*

But from these and other similar expressions in the inscription, we can draw no conclusion in favour of its authenticity.

Some grammarians and commentators on the Marbles have indeed observed, that, in ancient inscriptions,  $\gamma$  is used instead of  $\nu$ , at the end of a word, when the next begins with  $\gamma$ ,  $\kappa$ , or  $\chi$ : as,  $\tau\eta\gamma$  γραφην,  $\tau\omega\gamma$  κατοικων,  $\mu\epsilon\gamma$  καταλοχισμους,  $\tau\omicron\gamma$  χρονον; and instead of  $\kappa$ , when the following word begins with  $\delta$ ,  $\lambda$ , or  $\mu$ : as  $\epsilon\gamma$  δε,  $\epsilon\gamma$  Λυκω-  
βιας,  $\epsilon\gamma$  Μιτυληνης; and that  $\mu$  likewise, at the end of words\*, is used instead of  $\nu$ , before  $\beta$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\pi$ ,  $\phi$ ;  $\acute{o}$ : as,  $\gamma\eta\rho\alpha\iota\omicron\mu$  βιοτας,  $\epsilon\mu$  Μαγνησια,  $\epsilon\mu$  Πανδοις,  $\tau\eta\mu$  πολιν,  $\tau\omicron\mu$  πολε-  
μιν,  $\tau\eta\mu$  φιλαν,  $\tau\eta\mu$  ὁμολογαν †, &c.

But what reason could there be for introducing these archaisms, as they are called, into the Parian Chronicle? We do not usually find them in Greek writers of the same age, or even in those of the most early date. The reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus was not an age of rude antiquity, with respect to the Greek language. It was 600 years after the time of Homer and Hesiod, and 130 after that of Xenophon and Plato, when the

\* As a labial before another labial,  $\beta$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\pi$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\psi$ , in composition,  $\mu$  is COMMONLY used for  $\nu$ : as,  $\epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\nu\tau$ ,  $\sigma\epsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau$ ,  $\sigma\epsilon\mu\pi\tau\iota\kappa\alpha$ ,  $\sigma\epsilon\mu\phi\epsilon\tau$ ,  $\sigma\epsilon\mu\phi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau$ ; but not as a final.

Pleraque nos illâ quasi mugiente literâ claudimus  $\mu$ , quâ  $\nu\tau\iota$ -  
LUM Græcè verbum cadit. Quint. l. xii. c. 10.

Vocibus in Graiis nunquam ultima conspicior  $\mu$ .

Aulon. Edyl. 12.

It may be observed, by the way, that this is not an irregular verb, as some have erroneously imagined, who have called the final letter  $\epsilon\omega\iota$ , instead of  $\mu\omega$ .

In  $\mu$ , says J. Cæs. Scaliger, nullam vocem Græcia terminavit: barbaris nobisque modus nullus. De Const. Ling. Lat. l. i. c. 10. Vid. Scalig. Animadv. in Euseb. p. 114.

† Maittaire, Marm. Arund. p. 615. 636. Id. Ling. Græc. Dialect. p. 153. 381.

Greek language was spoken and written in its utmost purity and elegance.

We can scarcely suppose, that even a stone-cutter, in that refined age, would have been permitted to disgrace a superb and learned monument with such barbarisms.

However this may be, the preceding archaisms are not uniformly observed in the Chronicle. We find the author writing, a little inconsistently,

τον Παρνασσον, Parnassum. l. 4.

την Καδμειαν, Cadmeam. l. 12.

τον καρπον, fructum. l. 27.

μεν Κριτιου, quidè Critiæ. l. 52.

εν μαχη, in prælio. l. 63.

εν Πλαταιαις, ad Plataeas. l. 67.

I am almost tempted to suspect, that *εμ Παρω*, *εμ Μαραθωνι*, and other pretended archaisms, are owing to a mere affectation of antiquity, or to a corrupted dialect and pronunciation in later ages. For, if we may depend on the authority of Dr. Bentley, “the modern Greeks, though they write the *ν* in these cases, pronounce that letter as *μ* \*.”

These archaisms, I know, appear on other marbles; but, for that very reason, they would naturally be adopted by the fabricator of a supposititious inscription. And the authenticity of those inscriptions, in which they appear, must be established, before they can be produced, in opposition to the present argument.

\* Dissert. on Phal. § 14. p. 334.

## C II A P. III.

II. **I**T is scarcely probable, that such an expensive and cumbersome work, as the chronological marble, would have been executed by a private citizen, a philosopher, or an historian, at Paros, either for his own amusement, or for the benefit of his fellow-citizens.

This will appear by the following considerations. First, a long inscription, containing a general system of chronology, could not be engraved on marble, without such an expense, as few learned Greeks were able to afford. Or, if the author, by an uncommon felicity, was able to erect such a literary monument, the scheme would have been useless and imprudent; as all the contents of the inscription might have been published more commodiously and effectually, by the common mode of writing, in use at that time. For,

Secondly, a manuscript is more readily circulated from hand to hand, and copies of it more easily multiplied and dispersed. This inscription, it is true, might have been copied; but no writer of antiquity seems to have either seen or heard of such a copy.

Thirdly, a manuscript is easily corrected and improved, as the author, from time to time, may see occasion. But an inscription on marble is unalterable. On this account, a league, a statute, a decree, an epitaph, &c. which do not usually require any alteration, may be very properly inscribed on marble. Whereas a system of chronology, attended with innumerable difficulties, and frequently founded on mere conjectures, must ne-



cessarily demand repeated corrections. A writer therefore, of common prudence and discretion, would not subject himself to the impossibility of making occasional emendations in his own performance.

Fourthly, in a work of considerable extent, like the Parian Chronicle, containing a multiplicity of names, facts, and dates, a stone-cutter will inevitably make a number of mistakes\*, which can never be rectified on the marble. For instance, there is an error in the twenty-fifth epocha, either of the author, or of the stone-cutter, which it was not easy, or perhaps not possible, to correct, after the subsequent letters were engraved †.

Fifthly, the letters of an inscription on stone are liable to be defaced by a variety of accidents; and the smallest mutilation, in a numeral character, will totally destroy a chronological computation.

Lastly, ancient writers seem to have agreed, that a manuscript is more likely to be transmitted to posterity, than an inscription, either on marble or brass.

Ovid was certainly of this opinion, when he thus congratulated himself on the immortality of his writings, and bade defiance to the ravages of war and conflagrations, to the fury of winds and storms, and the devastations of time :

Jamque opus exegi, quod nec Jovis ira, nec ignes,  
Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetustas ‡.

Horace, on the publication of his odes, exclaims,

\* Plurima passim occurrunt errata quadratariorum. Id enim genus opifices, extra mechanicam artem lapidariam, non forsan admodum periti, uti nunc sæpe, ita et olim, errare soliti sunt. Marm. Arund. edit. Maitt. p. 573.

† See epoc. 25, where the omission of *εποχου* *και* occasions a gross impropriety.

‡ Ovid. Met. l. xv. 871.

Exegi

Exegi monumentum ære perennius \*,

“I have raised a monument more lasting than brass;”  
and consequently more durable than marble.

Thucydides, likewise, when he wrote the history of the Peloponnesian war, entitled it, *ἡτρημεν ἐς αἰῶνα*, “an everlasting possession †.”

But the author of the Parian Chronicle, supposing it to be genuine, must be supposed to have deviated from the common mode of writing, without any sort of propriety, or any reasonable motive; he must be supposed to have put himself to a considerable, and, at the same time, a useless expense; and to have committed his elaborate performance to a stone, which he could neither alter, nor conveniently remove, nor secure from violence, or the depredation of those, who might value the marble more than the inscription.

For these reasons it does not seem probable, that the Parian Chronicle was the production of a private citizen, either for his own use, or for the benefit of the public.

It may be said, that the practice of writing upon pillars, stones, or marble, whatever was thought worthy of being transmitted to posterity, was very common among the nations of antiquity; that we read of the pillars of Seth ‡, of Hermes or Mercury ||, and Acicarus the Babylonian §; and that Sanchoniatho,

\* Hor. l. iii. od. 30.

† Thucyd. l. i. § 22.

‡ The Jews had an old tradition, that the descendants of Seth erected two pillars, on which they inscribed their inventions; and one of them, if we may believe Josephus, remained in his time, *κατὰ γῆν τῆν Σιριαδὴν*, in terrâ Siriade, in the land of Siriad, or Sirias. Jos. Antiq. Jud. l. i. c. 2. § 3.

|| Jamblic. de Myst. Ægyp. sect. i. c. 2.

§ Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 15. p. 356. edit. Oxon. 1715.—  
Who

choniatho \*, Pythagoras, Plato †, Manetho ‡, and other ancient authors, collected many things in their writings from such ancient monuments.

In answer to this objection, we may remark, that nothing can be more fabulous and uncertain, than the accounts, which are transmitted to us, concerning the pillars, said to have been erected in the early ages. The pillars of Seth, for example, may be reckoned among the fictions or the mistakes || of Josephus. The place

Who Acicarus was, is uncertain. A late writer supposes him to have been Achiacharus, mentioned in the book of Tobit, c. i. 22. Dissert. in Daniel. secund. LXX. p. 381. Diogenes Laertius ascribes a book, entitled, Acicharus, to Theophrastus; but we know nothing of its contents. l. v. § 50.

\* Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 9. p. 32.

† Jamb. loc. cit.

‡ *Εν τῇ Σηταδίκῃ γῇ*. Manetho pretended, that he extracted his Egyptian dynasties from the pillars of Hermes. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 6. Maneth. apud Syncell. p. 40. Goari Annot. in loc.

|| Herodotus tells us, that he himself had seen some of the pillars of Sesostris, *ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίῃ*, in the Syrian Palestine, l. ii. § 106.

The pillar, which, Josephus says, was remaining in his time, was probably one of these; and having the name of Sesostris, or Sethos, inscribed upon it, he imagined it had been erected by the descendents of Seth. Or perhaps the pillar, which he ascribed to those antediluvian philosophers, was one of the pillars of Mercury or Thoth, mentioned by Manetho. Vid. Fabric. Cod. Pseud. tom. i. p. 150. Dodwell on Sanchon. § 13.

That an antediluvian pillar should be standing in the time of Josephus, is incredible. But it is not the only legendary tale, which we find in the writings of that author. The eloquent son of Matthias, though in other respects a valuable historian, relates many ridiculous fictions: such as that of the pillar of salt being then existing. Antiq. l. i. c. 11. § 4. of Eleazar and the demon. Ibid. l. viii. c. 2. § 5. of the Sabbatic river. De Bell. Jud. l. vii. c. 5. § 1. of the plant called Baaras. Ibid. c. 6. § 3, &c.



place where, he pretends, they existed, *κατα την Συριαδα* or *Σιριαδα*, was an unknown region, which has never been discovered.

It was no unusual thing to impose upon the world on the credit of such pillars. "Euhemerus," says the learned Mr. Dodwell, "was looked upon by antiquity, as a famous instance of it \*." It was certainly the easiest way for broaching falsehoods. These were monuments, which could be produced on a sudden, concerning the most remote antiquities, without the attestation of ancient writings; because they were supposed to be origi-

Speaking of the pillar of salt, he says, *ἵστορμα δ' αὖτε, ἐν γὰρ καὶ νῦν διαφύκει.* Eam siquidem VIDI, nam et hodie usque manet. edit. Haverc. 1726. In this passage, and in the story of the demon, he uses the word *ἵστορμα*, or *ἱστορία*, which is usually translated VIDI, "I have seen." But for the sake of his credit, I would rather suppose it ought to be translated, *memoravi*, de illâ *relationem accepi*, or *nunciatum est mihi de illâ*.

The author of a poem, entitled, SODOMA, annexed to the works of Tertullian, is not content with saying, the pillar of salt existed in his time, but he makes a WONDERFUL IMPROVEMENT in the story.

Durat adhuc etenim nudâ statione sub æthram,  
Nec pluviis dilapsa situ, nec diruta ventis.  
Quinetiam, si quis mutilaverit advena formam,  
Protinus ex sese suggestu vulnera complet.  
Dicitur et vivens, alio jam corpore, fœtus  
Munificos solito dispungere sanguine menses.

Tertull. Op. p. 644.

\* Euhemerus the Messenian composed a history of Jupiter and other gods, from materials, which he pretended to have collected in the course of his travels; particularly from an inscription on a golden pillar in the temple of Jupiter Triphylus, in an island called Panchæa, somewhere in the Arabian ocean. Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. ii. c. 2. p. 60. Lactan. l. i. c. 11. See Diodorus Siculus, l. v. p. 318, 319, where this island is described. Strabo and Plutarch represent Panchæa as a fabulous region, which nobody had ever seen. Strab. l. vii. p. 459. edit. 1707. Pausan. de Isid. et Osir. p. 360.



nals of the times they pretended to give an account of; were supposed to be remote from vulgar knowledge or understanding, being either kept in the adyta, or locked up in some obsolete, unknown character, which none but the learned and the priests could understand; were contrived in hieroglyphics, or such ambiguous notes, as were capable of what interpretation those designing persons, who produced them, were pleased to put upon them; were generally founded on oral tradition, than which there is not a more unfaithful conveyer of monuments to posterity; and wholly depended on the credit of the priests, who, at the same time, were generally interested in the things thus preserved, by their contributing to the support of their false religion, or to the honour of their nation for antiquity or rare inventions; and, lastly, were to be found and examined only in one place, not, like books, every where; nor even there, without the leave and direction of such interested priests. Upon this account, the stories, with which it was fashionable in those times to adorn their dialogues, were grounded on the credit of such pretended inscriptions: as, the table of Cebes; the Samothracian [Hyperborean] inscriptions, referred to by Axiochus \*; and those concerning the Atlantides in Timæus †.”

Almost all the fabricators of supposititious writings have pretended to derive their information from such obscure and suspicious sources. Thus, the publisher of the fragments, ascribed to Sanchoniatho, would make us believe, that he compiled his Phœnician history from the books of Taaut ‡, the *Ἀποκρυφα Ἀμμωνεων γραμματα*;

\* Plato [five *Æschines*] in *Axiocho*, p. 371. edit. Serrani, 1578.

† Plato in *Timæo*.—See Dodwell on *Sanch.* § 11.

‡ Taaut, “called by the *Ægyptians* Thoyth; by the *Alexandrians* Thoth; by the *Greeks* *Hermes*.” *Euseb. Præp. Evang.* l. i. c. 9.

the mystical records of the Ammonceans, concealed in the sacred recesses of their temples \*. Thus, Philostratus asserts, that he took his account of Apollonius Tyaneus from the memoirs of Damis the Assyrian †. Thus, Gelasius Cyzicenus tells us, that he found in his father's house an ancient volume, containing a history of the council of Nice ‡. And thus, Geoffrey of Monmouth would persuade us, that he translated his British history from an old manuscript, found in Armorica by Walter Calenius, archdeacon of Oxford, in the reign of Henry the First ||.

But allowing the ancient inscriptions abovementioned all the credit that can be desired; admitting it likewise as a fact, that mankind, in rude or early ages, wrote on stones §, bricks, tiles ¶, marble, lead,

\* Euseb. Præp. Evang. loc. cit.—The letters or writings of the Ammonceans, according to Bochart, were inscriptions or records, used in **𐤁𐤍𐤏𐤍** *hammanim*, in temples or shrines; for **𐤁𐤍**, *hamma*, signifies the sun, and **𐤏𐤍**, *hammon*, the temple of the sun. Phaleg. par. ii. l. ii. c. 17.—Sir John Marsham thinks, the Ammonei were the Thebans, or inhabitants of No-Ammon. Canon Chron. sec. x. p. 244.

† Philost. in v. Apollon. l. i. c. 3. Suidas.

‡ Cave, Hist. Liter. sub an. 476. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. v. c. 24. vol. viii. p. 371.

|| Galfredi Monumet. l. xii. c. 20. Leland de Script. Brit. c. 157. p. 187. Baleus, p. 180. Pitseus sub an. 1120, 1152.

§ Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 6. Lucan. l. iii. 222.—Gothos majorum acta patrii sermonis carminibus vulgata, linguæ suæ literis, faxis ac rupibus insculpenda curâsse. Saxo-Græm. Hist. Dan. præf.

¶ Epigenes apud Babylonios DCCXXX annorum observationes siderum, coëtilibus laterculis inscriptas, docet. Plin. l. vii. p. 56.

In this passage Pliny certainly wrote DCCXXX, or 720,000 years; for how could he produce the observations of 720 years as a

lead \*, copper, wood †, bark, &c. this could be no reason, why the author of the Parian Chronicle should engrave his performance on any of those materials.

The most ancient nations made use of them, because they were not acquainted with any thing more proper or convenient; and as there were but few in those rude ages, who practised the art of writing, it was ne-

cessary, that the use of letters among the Babylonians was *æternus*, eternal, or of the highest antiquity? Cicero mentions the observations of the Babylonians, for the space of 470,000 years; Diodorus for 473,000, and Africanus for 480,000. In a subsequent sentence Pliny says, “the lowest computation of them by Berosus and Critodemus was 480 years;” which should undoubtedly be 480,000. If these years are only *days*, as some writers maintain, 720,000 will make about 1972 Julian years. Vid. Cic. de Divinat. l. i. § 36. Diod. Sic. l. ii. p. 118. Afric. apud Syncell. p. 17.

The Babylonians wrote on tiles, because probably there were no stones at Babylon. The prophet Ezekiel, when he was a captive in that country, was ordered to make a representation of Jerusalem upon a tile, which was to be a symbolical or prophetic sign of its destruction by the king of Babylon. ch. iv. 1. Jackson, Chron. Antiq. vol. i. p. 218.

\* Pausanias relates, that the Boeotians, who lived near the fountain Hippocrene, shewed him a copy of Hesiod's poem, entitled *ERPA*, inscribed on lead. Pausan. l. ix. c. 31.

Hanc [papyrus] Alexandri Magni victoriâ repertam, auctor est M. Varro, conditâ in Ægypto Alexandriâ; antea non fuisse characterum usum; palmarum foliis primò scriptitatum; deinde quarundam arborum libris; postea PUBLICA MONUMENTA plumbeis voluminibus; mox et privata linteis confici coepta aut cereis. Puggillium enim usum fuisse etiam ante Trojana tempora invenimus apud Homerum, Il. vi. 169. Varronis Fragn. p. 230. Plin. l. xiii. c. 11. Front. Stratag. l. iii. c. 13. § 7. Job xix. 24.

† —————Leges incidere ligno.

Hor. Art. Poet. v. 399.

Solenis leges Athenis axibus ligneis incisæ sunt. A. Gell. l. ii. c. 12.

cessary



cessary to use the most solid and durable substances, for the preservation of their public acts and monuments. But long before the date of the Parian Chronicle, more commodious materials were invented.

In the oldest writings now extant, the Jewish scriptures, we frequently read of books and volumes. Moses mentions the book of the Covenant, the book of the Law, and the book of the Wars of the Lord\*. The author of the history of Joshua refers to the book of Jasher †. Job wishes, that his adversary had written a book ‡. David appeals to the VOLUME of the book ||. Solomon says, of making many books there is no end §. And, lastly, several of the prophets speak of ROLLS, and ROLLS of books ¶.

We have likewise an account of books and volumes, in the early ages of pagan antiquity.

Herodotus tells us, that *diphtheræ*, or the skins of sheep and goats, were used for writing by the ancient Ionians \*\*. Diodorus Siculus likewise informs us, that the ancient Persians wrote their records on skins ††.

\* Exod. xxiv. 7. Deut. xxxi. 26. Numb. xxi. 14.—Moses died bef. Chr. 1451 years. Usher.

† Joshua, x. 13.

‡ Job, xxxi. 35.

|| Psal. xl. 7. כְּסֵף בְּמִלְחָמָה, in volumine libri. לֵלֵךְ sig. *voluit, conuoluit, &c.*

§ Eccles. xii. 12.

¶ Isa. viii. 1. Jer. xxxvi. 2. Ezek. ii. 9.

\*\* Και τας βιβλους διφθερας καλεουσι απο του παλαιου ει Ιωνες, οτε ποτε, εγ σπανι βιβλων, εχρεωντο, διφθερησι αιγερισι τε και οιερσι. Priscâque consuetudine libros Iones appellant *diphtheras*, quod aliquandò, penuriâ biblorum, pellibus caprinis ovillisque utebantur. Herod. l. v. § 58.

†† Εν διφθεραις δὲ Περσαι τας παλαιας πράξεις, κατὰ τινὰ νομον, εἶχον συντεταγμένας. In membranis res antiquas Persie, quâdam lege, ordine descriptas habebant. Diod. Sic. l. ii. p. 113. Αρχαιότερα διφθερας, *diphtherâ* antiquiora. Suidas.



Varro relates, that the use of the Egyptian papyrus for writing on, was introduced, when Alexander the Great built Alexandria in Egypt \* ; that is, about the year bef. Chr. 332. Guilandinus endeavours to prove from Alcæus, Anacreon, Æschylus, the ancient comic poets, Plato, Aristotle, and others, that the papyrus was used for that purpose long before the time of Alexander †. Many of his testimonies indeed, as the learned Scaliger has shewn ‡, are fallacious ; yet it is evident from the words of Herodotus, cited in the margin, that the biblos or papyrus was used for writing in his time. It is not however necessary to prove, by the testimony of ancient authors, that books were written on parchment, on paper made of the Egyptian papyrus, or any such materials, before the date of the Parian Chronicle. This is sufficiently evinced by the very existence of the writings of Moses, David, Solomon, and the Jewish prophets ; the works of Homer, Hesiod, Anacreon, Pindar, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Hippocrates, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristotle, &c. and is still more incontestably proved by the libraries, which were collected in preceding ages, or about that time ; such as those of Polycrates in Samos, Pisistratus || and Euclides at Athens, Nicocrates in Cyprus, Euripides the poet, Aristotle the philosopher §, Clearchus at Heraclea Pontica ¶, and the most extensive and magnificent library of Ptolemy Phi-

\* Plin. loc. cit.

† Guilandinus de Papyro, p. 16. et seq.

‡ Scalig. Animadv. in Guiland. p. 9.

|| A. Gell. l. vi. c. 17. Tertull. Apol. c. 12. Montf. Palæog. Græc. pref. p. xvi.

§ Athen. l. i. c. 2. See below, chap. xi.

¶ Memnon de Reb. Heracleæ Ponticæ, apud Photium, cod. 224. c. 2.

ladelphus \* in Egypt, founded in or before the year 284, which in his time is said to have contained 100,000 volumes †; and to have been enlarged by his successors, to the amount of almost 700,000 ‡.

Not long afterwards a library was founded at Pergamus by Attalus and Eumenes, which, according to Plutarch, contained 200,000 volumes ||.

These

\* Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, surnamed Soter, the father of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was a learned prince, as appears by his history of Alexander, which is honourably mentioned by the ancients. Vid. Arriani Præf. Plut. in v. Alex. Q. Curt. l. ix. c. 5.

Suidas seems to intimate, that this prince collected a library; for he observes, “that Zenodotus the Ephesian lived in the time of the first Ptolemy, and was keeper των εν Αλεξανδρείᾳ βιβλιοθηκῶν, of the libraries in Alexandria.” Suid. in v. Ζηνόδοτος.

† Euseb. Chron. p. 66. Syncell. p. 271. Cedren. l. xxii. Some writers tell us, that Philadelphus collected 200,000 volumes. Jos. Antiq. l. xii. c. 2. § 1. Alex. ab Alex. l. ii. c. 30.

‡ A. Gell. l. vi. c. 17. Am. Marcell. l. xxii. c. 16.—Four hundred thousand volumes are said to have been unfortunately burnt, when Julius Cæsar was attacked in Alexandria by Achilles, the commander of the Egyptian army. Oros. l. vi. c. 15. Seneca says, 40,000, or, according to some editions, 400,000. Sen. de Tranq. c. 9. A. Gellius asserts, that the whole library, consisting of near 700,000 volumes, was destroyed: “ca omnia incensa sunt.” It is remarkable, that this unfortunate event is not mentioned, either by Julius Cæsar or Hirtius, in the history of the Alexandrian war.

|| Plut. in v. Anton. p. 943. Strab. l. xiii. p. 926. Plin. l. xiii. c. 10. l. xxxv. c. 2. Reges Attalici magnis philologie dulcedinibus induciti, cum egregiam bibliothecam Pergami ad communem delectationem instituisent; tunc item Ptolemæus infinito zelo, cupiditatique incitatus studio, non minoribus industriis, ad eundem modum contenderat Alexandria comparare. Vitruv. præf. l. vii. Vitruvius does not mean, that there was a library at Pergamus, before there was one at Alexandria. Some writers, who have charged him with a mistake in this passage, have not attended

These are clear and decisive proofs, that the common mode of writing, in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was NOT on STONES.

to the proper force of the word *contenderat*, in the præterpluperfect tense. Galen. in Hippoc. de Nat. Hom. Com. ii. p. 17.

The Ptolemean kings were, Ptolemy Soter or Lagi [filius], bef. Chr. 305. Ptol. Philadelphus, 285. Ptolemy Soter admitted his son Philadelphus into a share of the kingdom in 285, and died in 284. Ptol. Euergetes, 247. Ptol. Philopator, 222. Ptol. Epiphanes, 205. Ptol. Philometor, 181. Ptol. Euergetes the second, surnamed Physcon, 146. Ptol. Soter or Lathyrus, 117. Ptol. Alexander, 81. Ptol. Auletes, 65. Cleopatra, 51.

The kings of Pergamus were, Philetærus, 283. Eumenes, 263. Attalus, 241. Eumenes the second, 197. Attalus the second, 159. Attalus the third, 138. This prince died after a reign of five years, and made the Roman people his heirs. Eumenes the second founded, or at least improved, the celebrated library at Pergamus. Strab. l. xiii. p. 926. The Egyptian princes having prohibited the exportation of the papyrus, Eumenes ordered, that books should be made of parchment, which, from Pergamus, was called *pergamena*. Plin. l. xiii. c. 11. Isid. Orig. l. vi. c. 3. Hieron. Epist. ad Cromatium.

It is however very certain, that the kings of Pergamus were not the real inventors of parchment: they only found out a better way of making it, and brought it into more general use. Trotzius, de primâ scribendi Orig. p. 91. Funccius de Script. vet. p. 90.

C H A P. IV.

III. **T**HIS Chronicle does not appear to have been engraved by PUBLIC AUTHORITY, by the direction of the magistrates, or the people of Paros.

First, because inscriptions of that kind usually begin in this manner :

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ, “the senate and the people ;” or, in this form :

ΕΔΟΞΕΝ ΤΗ ΒΟΥΛΗΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ,  
“it pleased the senate and the people.”

E X A M P L E S.

Inscriptions in Spon's *Miscellanea Eruditæ Antiquitatis*,  
and other collections.

Athenis, in ædibus Jani Mistrigo. Sect. x. Inscript. 6.  
p. 319.

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ Η ΕΞ ΑΡΕΙΟΥ ΠΑΓΟΥ  
ΚΑΙ Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΤΩΝ Χ\*  
ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝ ΒΕΡΕΝΕΙΚΗΝ,  
κ. τ. λ.

Senatus Areopagi, & senatus sexcentorum, & populus,  
Juliam Berenicem, &c. hanc statuâ honorant.

\* Character ille, vel sigla  $\bar{x}$ , non mille, sed *sexcentos* solum, significat : hoc est, eandem prorsus vim ac valorem obtinet, perinde ac si minusculo characterē  $x$  pingeretur. Etenim Berenices & Agrippæ regis ætate, Atheniensis senatus ex sexcentis solum civibus constabat. Corfini *Notæ Græcorum*, p. 72. Id. *Fasti Attici*, tom. i. Dissert. vi. p. 262.

Megarīs.



Megaritis. Inscript. 11. p. 321.

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ  
ΤΙΒ. ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΝ ΑΤΤΙΚΟΝ.

Senatus & populus *Megarensis*, Tiberium Claudium  
Atticum, &c.

Megaritis. Inscript. 14. p. 327.

Ο ΔΑΜΟΣ  
ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΑ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΑ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΝ  
ΑΡΕΤΑΣ ΕΝΕΚΕΝ  
ΚΑΙ ΕΥΕΡΓΕΣΙΑΣ.

Populus imperatorem Cæsarem, Divi filium, virtutis &  
beneficiorum causâ, honorat.

*Δαμος* et *αρετας*, Doricâ dialecto, quæ η in ε mutat,  
pro *δημος* et *αρετης*.

Ibidem, ad ædem Panagias. Inscript. 16. p. 327.

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ  
Μ. ΑΙΜΙΛΙΟΝ ΣΑΤΟΥΡΝΕΙΟΝ.

Senatus et populus *Megarensium* M. Æmilium Saturni-  
num, &c. venerantur.

Constantinopoli, allata ex PARO insulâ. Inscript. 39.  
p. 334.

Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ  
ΤΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΗΣ ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΠΑΙΔΑ.

Senatus & populus *Pariorum* optimæ memoriæ filium,  
&c. honorârunt statuâ æneâ.

Venetis,

Venetiis, ad Cyzicum & insulam Paron pertinens inscriptio, ex Archipelago advecta \*. Inscript. 45. p. 336.

ΕΔΟΞΕΝ ΤΗΙ ΒΟΥΛΗΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ  
ΓΟΡΓΟΝΙΚΟΣ ΔΙΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΕΙΠΕΝ  
ΕΠΕΙ Η ΠΟΛΙΣ Η ΠΑΡΙΩΝ.

Placuit senatui & populo. Gorgonicus Dioc. f. dixit: quandoquidem urbs Pariorum, &c.

In Co insulâ. Inscript. 51. p. 337.

Α ΒΟΥΛΑ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΑΜΟΣ  
ΤΗΣ ΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑΤΗΣ  
ΚΩΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΤΕΙΜΑΣΕΝ.

Senatus populûsque illustrissimæ Coorum civitatis honoravit Publium Sallustium, &c.

Α βουλα και ο δαμος, Doricâ dialecto, pro η βουλη και ο δημος.

Smyrnæorum Decretum †.

ΕΔΟΞΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΩΝ ΓΝΩΜΗ.

Placuit populo ducum sententia, &c.

Senatûs populique Delii psephisma [decretum] quo Clinodemo, Leboti f. Siphnio, honores decernuntur ‡.

ΕΔΟΞΕΝ ΤΗΙ ΒΟΥΛΗΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ.  
ΤΙΜΟΚΛΗΣ ΤΕΛΕΣΙΠΠΟΥ ΕΙΠΕ.

Placuit senatui & populo. Timocles Telestippi f. relationem fecit, &c.

\* Vid. Montf. Diar. Ital. c. 3.

† Chand. Marm. Oxon. Inscript. 26. p. 41.

‡ Reinellii Inscript. Antiq. p. 499. Seld. in Mar. Arund. num. xii. Maitt. p. 566.

This is the usual introductory form of inscriptions, composed by public authority. But the Parian chronologer begins HIS inscription in a very different manner, as follows :

ΑΝΕΓΡΑΨΑ τοὺς ἀνωθεν χρόνους, ΑΡΞΑΜΕΝΟΣ ἀπο Κεκροπος, “ I have described preceding times, beginning from Cecrops.”

These are the words of a private man, speaking of his own performance in the first person singular, and do not in the least correspond with those forms of expression, which we generally find in inscriptions, composed by the order of the senate or the people of any country.

This argument cannot be much affected by observing, that the beginning of the inscription is obliterated ; for it entirely depends on the words now remaining.

Secondly, the facts and dates, which are mentioned in this Chronicle, do not appear to have been extracted from any public records, or calculated to answer the purpose of authentic documents. For, in either view, it is most probable, the compiler would have preserved a regular series of kings and archons. But this is not the case. Many eminent princes and magistrates are passed over without notice. The facts, chiefly specified, are not matters of general or national importance ; and, in several instances, the transactions of whole centuries are entirely omitted.

Thirdly, the Parian inscription is such a one, as we can hardly suppose the magistrates, or the people of Paros, would have ordered to be engraved.

Stately sepulchres, pillars, triumphal arches, and the like, were erected to perpetuate the glory of eminent men ; and inscriptions upon them usually displayed their  
various

various achievements \*. Thus, we read of the pillars of Osiris, Bacchus, Sesostris †, Hercules ‡, and others.

The remembrance of events, in which nations were interested, the succession of princes, and perhaps the genealogies of eminent men ||, were preserved in the same manner.

Leagues §, decrees, laws, &c. were likewise engraved on marble or brass, and fixed to a pillar, the walls of a temple, or other public buildings.

The Decalogue was written upon tables of hewn stone; and Joshua is said to have written a copy of the law upon the same materials ¶. In the time of Demosthenes there still existed a law of Theseus, written upon

\* —Incisa notis marmora PUBLICIS.

Hor. l. iv. od. 8.

† Herod. l. ii. § 106. Diod. Sic. l. i. p. 53. Strab. l. xvi. p. 1114. l. xvii. 1138.

‡ Diod. Sic. l. iv. p. 226.

|| Ακουσίλαος εγραψε γενεαλογίας εκ δελτων χαλκων, ως λογος ευρειν τον πατερα αυτου, ορυζαντα τινα τοπον της οικιας αυτου. “Acusilaus wrote genealogies from tables of brass, which, it was reported, his father found, as he was digging in some part of his house.” Suidas.

Nothing can be more apocryphal and suspicious, than the origin of these genealogical tables. It has been always usual with the fabricators of supposititious inscriptions to pretend they found them, as Acusilaus did, under ground, in some cavern, or secret recess.

§ Thucydides speaks of Grecian pillars, on which treaties of peace and alliance were inscribed, at Olympia, at Pytho or Delphi, at the Isthmus, at Athens, at Lacedæmon, and other places, lib. v. c. 18. Dionysius Halicarnassæus mentions several treaties, which were engraved on pillars: as, that of Romulus with the Veientes, l. ii. c. 6. p. 118. that of Tullus Hostilius with the Sabines, l. iii. c. 8. p. 174. and that of Tarquinius Superbus with the Latins, l. iv. c. 6. p. 249.—Liv. l. ii. c. 33.

¶ Exod. xxxiv. 1. Josh. viii. 32. Deut. xxvii. 8.



a pillar of stone \*. Certain decrees, in the reign of Servius Tullus, were inscribed on a brazen column †. And the laws of the Twelve Tables were engraved on brass ‡.

Virgil alludes to this custom in the following verse :

———Fixit leges pretio, atque refixit ||.

And Ovid, in describing the golden age,

—————Nec verba minacia fixo  
Ære legebantur §.

Suetonius informs us, that Vespasian, when he rebuilt the capitol, after it had been burnt by the soldiers of Vitellius, undertook to restore 3000 brazen plates, which were destroyed by the flames ; and that by searching for copies of them in all places, he furnished the government with a fresh collection of curious and ancient records, containing the decrees of the senate, and the acts of the people, relative to treaties, alliances, and privileges, from times almost as early as the foundation of the city ¶.

These inscriptions, and others of the same kind, may be considered as public monuments, or public records ; and were inscribed on marble or brass, with peculiar propriety, as they were professedly designed for the inspec-

\* Εν στήλῃ λιθινῇ. Demosth. contra Neæram [εἰς γνησιότητος. Harpoc.] p. 873. edit. 1604.

† Dion. Halic. l. iv. c. 3. p. 230.

‡ Leges decemvirales, quibus tabulis duodecim est nomen, in æs incisas, in publico proposuerunt. Liv. l. iii. 57. Dion. Halic. l. x. c. 13. p. 681. Flor. l. i. c. 24.—A. Gellius informs us, that the laws of the XII Tables were written 300 years after the building of Rome. A. Gell. l. xx. c. 1.

|| Virg. Æn. vi. 622.

§ Ovid. Met. l. i. 91.

¶ Suet. in v. Vesp. § 8. Tacit. Hist. l. iii. c. 7.

tion of the people ; and essentially concerned their conduct, their property, their liberty, or their lives. But for whom could the Chronicle of Paros be intended ?—It contains no encomiums on any of the patriots, the heroes, or the demi-gods, of the country ; no decrees of the magistrates, no public records, no laws of state. On the contrary, it is a work of mere speculation and learning, in which the inhabitants of that island, especially the common people, had not the least interest or concern.

These words at the beginning, ἀρχοντος ἐμ. Παρώ, would naturally lead us to suppose, that the inscription related to Paros ; and there were certainly many circumstances in the history of that island, worthy of notice.—I shall mention some of them.

Thucydides informs us, that the Cyclades were first inhabited by the Phœnicians and the Carians \* ; that Minos fitted out a fleet, took possession of those islands, planted colonies in most of them, and, having expelled the Carians, gave the government to his sons †.

Apollodorus relates, that Hercules, when he was going to fetch the belt of Hippolyta, stopped at Paros ; and that Eurymedon, Chryses, Nephalion, and Philolaus, the sons of Minos, then resided in that island ‡. The same author observes, that the mother of these four princes was a native of Paros || ; and that Minos himself was there, and offering a sacrifice to the Graces, when he received the melancholy news of the death of his son Androgeus §.

\* Stephanus Byzantinus says, “ Paros was first inhabited by Cretans, and a few Arcadians.” Steph. in v. Παρος.

† Thucyd. l. i. § 4. 8.

‡ Apollod. l. ii. c. 5. § 9. Apollodorus calls this famous belt Ἀγαστὴ ζώνη, “ the belt of Mars.”

|| Id. l. iii. c. 1. § 2.

§ Id. l. iii. c. 14. § 7.

Diodorus asserts, that after the destruction of Troy, the Carians, being grown more powerful, assumed the dominion of the sea, and having taken possession of the Cyclades, claimed some of them as their exclusive property, expelling the Cretans ; and inhabited others, in conjunction with the people, who were already settled in those islands \*.

Herodotus gives us the following anecdote of the Parians. The government of Miletus having been subverted by internal dissensions, the citizens requested the Parians to be arbitrators of their disputes. The Parians accepted the office ; and, having surveyed the country of Miletus, appointed those to the magistracy, whose lands were best cultivated ; reasonably concluding, that they who took proper care of their own estates, would not neglect the affairs of the commonwealth †. This prudent advice restored the city to its former tranquility.

C. Nepos asserts, that Miltiades subjected the Cyclades to the government of the Athenians ‡. Yet afterwards the Parians assisted Darius in his expedition against Greece. Miltiades, in order to punish them for this offence, or rather to revenge an affront offered to himself, the year after the victory at Marathon ||, invaded the island, and laid siege to the capital. But the inhabitants defended themselves with so much bravery, that, after he had invested the city for twenty-six days, without success, he raised the siege, and returned to Athens in disgrace §.

\* Diod. Sic. l. v. sub fin.

† Herod. l. v. § 28, 29.

‡ C. Nepos, in v. Milt. § 2.

|| The battle of Marathon was fought in the year of the J. P. 4224. bef. Chr. 490. Petav. Rat. Temp. vol. ii. p. 126. Dodw. Annal. Thucyd. p. 44. Corfini Fast. Attic. tom. iii. p. 148.

§ Herod. l. vi. § 133. C. Nep. in v. Milt. § 7.



After the victory at Salamis, Themistocles exacted large contributions of the Parians, and other islanders in the Ægean sea, under pretence of punishing them for the favour they had shewn the Persians \*.

In the year 431, at the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, we find all the Cyclades, except Melos and Thera, in alliance with the Athenians †.

In the year 405, Lysander the Spartan general totally defeated Conon the Athenian at Ægos-potamos. Not long afterwards he reduced all the cities, which had been subject to the Athenians, under the Spartan government; and, in 404, taking the city of Athens, put an end to the Peloponnesian war ‡.

In 394, Conon the Athenian, having the command of the Persian fleet, gained a complete victory over the Lacedæmonians near Cnidus; and among other states dependent on Lacedæmon, obliged the Cyclades to return to their former alliance ||.

In 385, the Parians, by the advice of an oracle, sent a colony into the Adriatic, and took possession of an island called Parus §, and afterwards Pharos, which occasioned a war between the ancient inhabitants of that island and the Parians ¶.

C. Nepos observes, that in the time of Miltiades, Pa-

\* Herod. l. viii. § 112.

† Thucyd. l. ii. § 9.—Thera was a Lacedæmonian colony. Strab. l. x. p. 741.

‡ Tributarias Atheniensium civitates voluntarias recepit. Just. l. v. c. 7. Xenoph. Hellen. l. ii. Diod. Sic. l. xiii. p. 226. Vid. Palmerii Exerc. p. 64.

|| Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 303.

§ *Φαρος, ἡ προτερον Παρος*. Pharos, quæ olim Parus. Strab. l. vii. p. 484. Marcian. Herac. Perieg. v. 426.

¶ Diod. Sic. l. xv. p. 336.—The part of the Chronicle yet remaining comes down to the year 354, which is 31 years after the planting of this colony.



ros was “*opibus elata*,” elated with its riches; and Ephorus remarks, that it was then the most flourishing, and the most considerable, of the Cyclades\*.

This island is said to have taken its name from Paros, the son of Parafius, an Arcadian. Stephanus tells us, that it was likewise called Pactia, Demetrias, Zacynthus, Hyria, Hyleessa, Minoa, and Cabarnis †.

Archilochus, the inventor or the first improver of the Iambic verse, was a native of Paros ‡. This ancient poet is mentioned by many of the Greek and Roman writers with great encomiums. Horace thought his numbers and poetic spirit worthy of his imitation ||. Quintilian says, his writings were distinguished by energy of language, comprehensive brevity, striking sentiments, and poignancy of satire §. Valerius Maximus represents him as the greatest poet, or the next to the greatest ¶. Pindar informs us, that one of the

\* Παρίν δὲ εὐδαιμονεστάτην καὶ μέγιστην οὖσαν τότε τῶν Κυκλαδῶν, Parum verò felicissimam ac maximam eo tempore Cycladum. Ephorus apud Steph. Byzant. in v. Παρος.

If the word μέγιστην means “the largest” of the Cyclades, it is not true. Pliny affirms, that Paros is but half as large as Naxos, which he reckons 75 miles in circuit. Paros therefore must be only 37; and this, according to M. Tournefort, agrees with the measurement of the natives. Plin. l. iv. c. 12. Tournef. Voyage, let. 5.

† Nicanor apud Steph. Byzant. Plin. loc. cit. Solin. c. 17.

‡ Ἀρχιλόχος ὁ Παρίος, Archilochus ille Parius. Herod. l. i. § 12. Strab. l. x. p. 745.

|| —————Parios ego primus iambos  
Ostendi Latio, numeros animósque secutus  
Archilochi. ————— Hor. l. i. ep. 19. 23.

§ Summa in Archilocho vis elocutionis, tum validæ, tum breves, vibrantesque sententiæ, &c. Quint. l. x. c. 1.

¶ Maximum poetam, aut certè summo proximum. Val. Max. l. vi. c. 3. V. Patere. l. i. c. 5. Cic. Orat. § 1. Id. ad Attic. l. xvi. ep. 11.

hymns of Archilochus was in such estimation, that it was usually sung three times to the honour of those, who had gained the victory at the Olympic games \*.

Aristides the rhetorician places him in the first rank of those illustrious poets, who have been an ornament to their country. Homer, he observes, has added a glory to Smyrna, Archilochus to Paros, Hesiod to Bœotia, Simonides to Ceos, Stesichorus to Himera, Pindar to Thebes, Sappho and Alcæus to Mitylene †. “Wise men,” says Alcidas, as quoted by Aristotle, “are respected in all countries. For this reason, Archilochus, though he was the author of some defamatory compositions, was honoured by the Parians ‡.”

Some of the foregoing circumstances, and perhaps others of more importance, which are not mentioned by the Greek historians, would have naturally occurred to an ancient writer, composing an inscription for a marble monument in the island of Paros.

But what scheme does our chronologer pursue on this occasion? Does he record the events and revolutions of his own country? Does he mention any of the battles, sieges, treaties, of the Parians? any of their public institutions? any of their poets, patriots, or warriors? Does he mention Archilochus, who was honoured by his countrymen, and distinguished, as a poet, in a general assembly of the Greeks?—Not a syllable on any of

\* Pind. Olymp. ix. 1.

† *Æl. Arist. in Epit. Alexandri.*

‡ Πάντες τοὺς σοφοὺς τιμᾶσι. Περὶ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου, καὶ τῶν ἑστῶτων οὐτα, τετιμῆκασι. Omnes sapientes honorant. Particular Archilochum, quamvis maledicum, honorant. *Apud Arist. Rhet. l. ii. c. 23.*

Cicero places Archilochus about the year bef. Chr. 720. *Tuſc. Quæst. l. i. § 1.* C. Nepos, about 668. *Apud A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21.*

these subjects ! On the contrary, he rambles from place to place, and records the transactions of Athens, Corinth, Macedon, Lydia, Crete, Cyprus, Sicily, Persia, and other foreign countries, with which Paros had no connection.

In this view, the inscription seems to have been as IMPERTINENT, in the island of Paros, as a marble monument would be in this country, recording the antiquities of France or Spain ; or one in Jamaica, containing the revolutions of England.

Upon a supposition, that the inscription is a forgery, it is easy to account for this extraordinary circumstance. A few chronological occurrences, in the ancient history of Paros, would not have been so interesting to the generality of readers ; or so valuable, in the estimation of every lover of antiquities ; or, in short, so PROFITABLE to the compiler, as a general system of Grecian chronology.

## C H A P. V.

IV. **I**T has been frequently observed, that the earlier periods of the Grecian history are involved in darkness and confusion.

Several of the ancients inform us, that the first writers of Greece were poets \*, whose chief object was to amuse their readers, or to excite their admiration, by marvellous details, by personifying all parts of nature, and by introducing a multitude of imaginary divinities.

In the earliest accounts of that country, we meet with scarcely any thing but poetical fictions, the genealogies, the amours, and the adventures of gods and demi-gods †. These mythological tales are incompatible with a regular chronology.

Herodotus, who wrote 444 years before the Christian æra ‡, and is emphatically styled the father of history ||,

\* ΠΡΩΤΕΡΟΝ ΜΕΝ ΕΝ ΠΟΙΗΜΑΣΙΝ ΕΞΕΦΕΡΟΝ ΟΙ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΙ ΤΑ ΔΟΓΜΑΤΑ, ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΛΟΓΟΥΣ, ΩΣΠΕΡ ΟΡΦΕΥΣ, ΚΑΙ ΉΣΙΟΔΟΣ, ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΜΕΝΙΔΗΣ, ΚΑΙ ΞΕΝΟΦΑΝΗΣ, ΚΑΙ ΕΜΠΕΔΟΚΛΗΣ, ΚΑΙ ΘΑΛΗΣ. Antiquitūs carmine suas sententias philosophi proferebant, ut Orpheus, Hesiodus, Parmenides, Xenophanes, Empedocles, Thales. Plut de Pyth. Orac. p. 402. Strab. l. i. p. 34. Profam orationem condere Pherecydes Syrius instituit, Cyri regis ætate. Plin. l. vii. c. 56.—Pherecydes wrote about 540 years before Christ.

† Καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι δὲ ἱστορικοὶ, καὶ φυσικοὶ, μυθολογοῦντες. Et quidem primi etiam historici, ac naturæ rerum descriptors, fabulas scripserunt. Strab. l. i. p. 37.

‡ Herodotus was born in the year bef. Chr. 484, and died some time after the year 432. Vid. l. ix. § 73. A. Gell. l. xv. c. 23. Corsini Fasti Attici, tom. iii. p. 157. 213. &c.

|| Pater historiæ. Cic. de Leg. l. i. § 5. Princeps genus hoc ornavit. Id. de Orat. l. ii. § 36.



seems to have related all the memorable occurrences he could find in the history of the Lydians, Assyrians, Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, and other nations, within the compass of 240 years; continuing his narrative to the taking of Sestus\*, or the conclusion of the Persian war in 479. But he is irregular and desultory, and seems to have had no idea of any chronological order or precision. His utmost efforts, in this department of history, consists in determining the length of a reign, and in a vague and general computation of time by the ages of men. Thus, he says, “the Heraclidæ, or the descendants of Hercules, possessed the kingdom of Lydia for the space of 505 years, during twenty-two *γενεαὶ ἀνδρῶν*, generations of men †.” “Semiramis lived, *γενεῶσι πέντε*, five generations, before another queen, whose name was Nitocris ‡.” He mentions the Argonautic expedition,

\* Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 29.

† Herod. l. i. § 7. In this passage Herodotus makes a generation consist of near 23 years. But in book ii. § 142. he tells us, that “three generations are equivalent to a hundred years.” Ancient writers observed no consistency in the use of the word *γενεα*. Sometimes they employed it to express a certain number of years, and sometimes a succession of father and son, or the extent of a reign. Herodoti *γενεα*, says Vossius, constituit annos  $33\frac{1}{2}$ .—*γενεα* Græcis grammaticis aliquando est spatium 20, aliquando 25, 30, 33, nonnumquam etiam plurium annorum. Imo etiam 100 aliquando: uti est apud Theophrastum; vel etiam 110 annorum intervallum continet *γενεα*, ut docet Phlegon. Rectè itaque notatum Porphyrio, quanto vetustiores, tanto longiores esse *γενεας*. Is. Vossii Castig. Hornii de Ætate Mundi, c. 6. Grævii Lect. Hesiod. c. 4. p. 21. Censor. c. 17.

‡ Herod. l. i. § 184.—According to Herodotus, § 188, Nitocris was “the mother of Labynetus,” or Nabonedus, supposed to be the Belshazzar of the scriptures, in whose reign Babylon was taken, bef. Chr. 539. On a supposition that she was the wife of Evilmerodach; that Evilmerodach was the son of Nebuchadnezzar; and that she assumed the government of the kingdom, soon after

pedition, the Trojan war, and other ancient events; but he never attempts to ascertain the time, when those persons lived, or those transactions occurred, by referring them to any known and determinate epocha.

The antiquity, which he ascribes to the kings of Egypt, is extravagant and incredible. The Egyptians, he says, reckoned from Menes to Sethon, 341 generations, or 11,340 years\*; from Bacchus to Amasis, 15,000†; and from Hercules to Amasis, 17,000‡. He seems to have collected his materials, according to

after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, in the year 562, the five generations of Herodotus will extend no higher, than to the year 728.

Sir Isaac Newton thinks, this remarkable queen was the wife of Nabonassar, the author of the famous astronomical æra, which commenced bef. Chr. 747. Chron. p. 281. Scaliger imagines, that Nitocris was the wife of Nebuchadnezzar, and that she governed the kingdom during the madness of her husband; and that the Semiramis of Herodotus was the celebrated wife of Ninus. Upon this principle, instead of πεντε, five, he would read πεντεκστή, fifty generations; that is, 1666 years, which will place Semiramis about the year bef. Chr. 2228. Not. ad Fragm. apud Emend. Temp. p. 14. 42.

Though it is perhaps impossible to find either truth or consistency in the history of Semiramis, and the origin of the Babylonian empire, yet the Mosaic account of the early settlement of mankind in the land of Shinar, or Babylonia, favours the supposition of their high antiquity. See an account of the Babylonian calculations in the notes to Chap. III.

\* Herod. l. ii. § 142.—If three generations were equivalent to a hundred years, 341 generations were equivalent to 11,366 years and eight months.

† Id. l. ii. § 145.

‡ Id. l. ii. § 43.—Sethon began to reign about the year bef. Chr. 719 or 722. Amasis about 568 or 569. Usserii Annal. Jackson's Chron. Antiq. vol. ii. p. 230, 240.

the

the usual custom of travellers, from report \*, or tradition; and very seldom alleges the authority of preceding writers.

Thucydides, who was thirteen years younger than Herodotus †, begins his history with a short account of ancient Greece, and briefly relates the events, which happened between the retreat of Xerxes in 480, where Herodotus ends, and the Peloponnesian war, comprehending a period of fifty years inclusively. After these preliminaries, he proceeds, in the second book, to the great object he had in view, the history of that war, which commenced in the spring of the year, bef. Chr. 431 (when Pythodorus had been ten months archon at Athens) and lasted twenty-seven years and six months. In this work he records the transactions of every summer and winter in a regular series ‡, and concludes with an account of the victory obtained by the Athenian fleet at Cynossema ||, and a cursory view of some other events, which happened about autumn in 411, or the twenty-first year of the Peloponnesian war. Thucydides died before he had completed his design, and left his eighth book unfinished §.

\* *κατὰ ἤκουον*, “as I have heard.” l. ii. § 99. See also l. ii. § 3. 5. 10. 12. 29. 55. 79. 100. 102. 116. 120. 122. 123. 127, &c.

† A. Gell. l. xv. c. 23.—Thucydides was born in the year bef. Chr. 471, and died in 391.

‡ The summer, as Thucydides divides the year, extends from the vernal to the autumnal, and the winter from the autumnal to the vernal, equinox.

|| *κενὸς σημεῖα*, canis sepulchrum; called by Diodorus *Ἡκυβῆς μνημεῖον*, Hecubæ monumentum. Diod. l. xiii. p. 167.

§ The eighth book concludes with this remark, which seems to have been added by another hand: “When the winter following this summer shall be ended, the twenty-first year of the war will be also completed.”

The



## THE PARIAN CHRONICLE. 87

The history of the Peloponnesian war, from the year 411, to its conclusion in 404, and the history of the subsequent affairs of Greece, is continued by Xenophon\*, through a period of 48 † or 49 years, ending with the battle of Mantinea, and the death of Epaminondas in 362 ‡.

These two histories comprehend a period of seventy years, in the form of ANNALS; and this form, as far as it extends, may be thought a sufficient notation of time. But many incidental circumstances, many antecedent events, are related without any chronological distinction, or reference to any memorable epocha.

This account of the imperfect state of chronology, in the time of these historians, corresponds with the following observation, made by the very learned and accurate Sir John Marsham.

Sanè *ιστορικον* scribendi genus longè vetustius est, quàm *χρονολογικον*. Priscis historicis nuda fuit rerum gestarum narratio; nec certis temporum intervallis distincta; nec à termino fixo deducta. In hâc classe censendi sunt Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, et qui perierunt reliqui; quorum scripta, antequam nata esset ars chronologica, prodierunt. Hi, licèt Olympiorum aliquando obiter meminerint, tetraëtericam tamen Olympiadum computationem non agnoscunt ||.

• Some think there is a chasm of near two years between the period, at which the history of Thucydides ends, and the Grecian history of Xenophon begins. Usserii Annal. sub an. J. Per. 4303. But Dodwell denies, that there is any such hiatus; and his opinion is now generally followed. Dodwell de Cyclis Vet. diss. viii. § 20. p. 342.—Xenophon was born about the year 450, and died in 360, at the age of ninety. Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 56. Lucian. in Macrob.

† Diod. Sic. l. xiii. p. 169.

‡ Id. l. xv. p. 395. Corfin. Fast. Attic. vol. iv. p. 17.

|| Canon. Chron. sec. xvi. p. 486.

Thucydides,



Thucydides, in order to ascertain the time of an event, which happened in the LXXXVIII Olympiad, does not specify the number of the Olympiad, but mentions it in these terms: "It was that Olympiad, in which Dorieus the Rhodian was the second time victorious \*." When the Olympiads began to be used in chronology, they were distinguished by their respective numbers.

The series of Olympiads, archons, and ephori, in Xenophon's Grecian history, is the interpolation of some impertinent annotator †.

Historians had not yet fixed upon any certain epocha, from which they might deduce their chronological computations. Neither the destruction of Troy, the institution of the Olympic games, nor the foundation of any city, was employed for that purpose.

It is very observable, that, at this period, historical records were so scarce, or so defective, that even the most inquisitive and the best informed writers were unacquainted with the revolutions and the most remarkable transactions of neighbouring kingdoms, which happened within a century of their own time ‡. Thus Herodotus and Xenophon differ EXTREMELY, in the accounts they give of several important circumstances in the history of Cyrus the Great, particularly with respect to

\* Thucyd. l. iii. § 8.

† Ineptissima ista Olympiadum, archontum, ephorum *επιχειρωσις*, quæ in Hellenica Xenophontis irrepsit, glossatoris ejuspiam inscientiam prodit. Marsh. Can. Chron. fec. xvi. p. 487. Dodwell, Præl. Academ. inaug. § 7. Id. de Cyclis Vet. diss. viii. § 23. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. iii. c. 4. vol. ii. p. 73.

‡ Cyrus died in the year bef. Chr. 529. Herodotus was born at Halicarnassus, in Asia Minor, in the year 484; and Xenophon about 34 years afterwards. The latter accompanied the younger Cyrus into Persia.

the birth and the death of that prince, and the establishment of the Persian empire.

Herodotus relates, that Cyrus was the son of Cambyses, a Persian of inferior rank, and Mandane, the daughter of Astyages; that, in consequence of a dream, his grandfather Astyages ordered, that he should be put to death in his infancy; that, contrary to his directions, he was preserved, and educated among shepherds; that when he was grown to maturity, he dethroned Astyages, and transferred the empire to the Persians; that, after a reign of twenty-five years, he was slain in battle, by the forces of Tomyris, queen of the Massagetes, who cut off his head, and threw it into a vessel full of human blood, with a sarcastic reflection on his cruelty and ambition\*.

Xenophon, on the contrary, informs us, that Cambyses was king of Persia; that Cyrus was educated in his father's court; that when he was twelve years of age, he went with his mother Mandane to visit Astyages, who entertained him with great liberality and affection; that Astyages died in peace, and left his kingdom to his son Cyaxares; and lastly, that Cyrus, after a reign of conquests and glory, died, like a philosopher, in his own palace, surrounded by his family and his friends.

Ctesias, in his account of this prince, differs from Herodotus and Xenophon in almost every circumstance†. Diodorus says, he was taken captive by the

\* Herod. l. i. § 107, &c.

† Ταῦτα λέγει Κτησίας: περί Κυροῦ, καὶ οὐχ ὡς Ἡρόδοτος. Hæc dicit Ctesias de Cyro, iis quæ ab Herodoto referuntur dissimilia. Ctesiasæ Fragm. apud Phot. Bibl. cod. 72. Herod. Op. p. 812.—Ctesias was of Cnidus, and attended the younger Cyrus in his Persian expedition.

queen of the Scythians, and crucified \*. Joannes Malala relates, that he was killed in a sea-fight with the Samians; and for the truth of this assertion, he cites a history, falsely ascribed to Pythagoras †.

Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, I know, is generally regarded as a moral or political romance. But it may be observed, that the author himself disclaims this idea ‡; and that a judicious writer would scarcely venture to form a romance on a recent period of history, in direct opposition to public records and well-known facts ||. On the other hand, if there were no records, and those facts were generally unknown, or sunk into oblivion, the argument I would draw from the different accounts, given of this celebrated hero by Herodotus, Xenophon, and others, remains in its full force.

About four hundred years before the Christian æra, Hippias the Elean published a catalogue of the victors at the Olympic games §. This catalogue, as Plutarch observes, was written οψε, late, that is, 376 years after the first Olympiad, in which Coræbus was victor in the

\* *Ανεσταυρωσε*, cruci affixit. Diod. Sic. l. ii. p. 128.

† Malalæ Chron. p. 201. Cedren. p. 114.

‡ Xenophon, in the beginning of his *Cyropædia*, tells us, “that he had taken great pains to inform himself of Cyrus's birth, education, and character; and that he would not advance any thing, but what had been told him.”

|| Strabo, Plutarch, Q. Curtius, Arrian, and others, agree, that Cyrus was buried at Pasargadæ in PERSIA; which is hardly consistent with the story of Herodotus. Strab. l. xv. p. 1061. Plut. in v. Alex. p. 703. Q. Curt. l. x. c. 1. Arrian. l. vi. sub fin.

See Prid. Connect. an. 530, where the author gives several reasons, why he thinks Xenophon's account of the death of Cyrus is more probable, than that of Herodotus.

§ *Των Ολυμπιονικων αναγραφη*, Olympionicarum Recensio. Plut. in v. Numæ, § 1. Schol. ad Theoc. Idyl. 4.



stadion; but, what is worse, he affirms, that it was “ a performance of no authority \*.” Yet, as the direction of the games properly belonged to the people of Elis †, Hippias may be supposed to have had the best information, which could be obtained. His publication however seems to have been but a bare list of names, merely calculated to distinguish the victors, and excite emulation in others ‡, without being applied to any chronological purpose.

About the year 338, Ephorus of Cuma in Æolia, one of the disciples of Isocrates, wrote a history of Greece and other countries, from the return of the Heraclidæ into Peloponnesus ||, to the siege of Perinthus by Philip of Macedon, in the year 340, comprehending a period of 750 years §. He is said to have distributed his materials into different books *κατὰ γένος*, “ according to the nature of the subject ¶;” but we are not told, that he observed the order of time. His veracity is called in question by several ancient writers \*\*.

Callisthenes and Theopompus lived at the same time. The former was Aristotle’s relation, and attended Alexander in his expedition into Asia. Among other productions ††, he wrote a history of Greece, entitled,  
*Ἑλληνικά,*

\* *Ἀπ’ οὐδενος ὀρίσμενον ἀναγκαστοῦ πρὸς πίσιν.* Nullis certis fultum argumentis. Plut. loc. cit.

† Strab. l. viii. p. 544, 545.

‡ Pausan. in Eliac. l. vi. c. 6.

|| The return of the Heraclidæ is placed by the generality of chronologists bef. Chr. 1103, or 1104 years.

§ Diod. Sic. l. iv. § 1. Id. l. xvi. p. 468.

¶ *κατὰ γένος*, in certum rerum genus. Diod. Sic. l. v. p. 285.

\*\* Id. l. i. p. 37. Sen. Nat. Quæst. l. vii. c. 16. Centor. c. 17.

†† A spurious history of Alexander the Great, under the name of Callisthenes, is said to be, or to have been, extant in manuscript, in



Ἑλληνικά, Hellenica, which commenced at the year bef. Chr. 394.

The latter was a disciple of Isocrates, and likewise wrote a history of Greece, in twelve books, beginning where Thucydides ends, and concluding with the sea-fight near Cnidus, in 395, including a period of seventeen years \*. Diodorus observes, that these three writers, “ Ephorus, Callisthenes, and Theopompus, did not attempt to relate the occurrences of ancient times, because they would not admit of any chronological computation †.” Cicero informs us, that Callisthenes wrote a narrative of the siege of Troy ‡. But this work might have no more chronology in it, than the Iliad of Homer.

Timæus Siculus lived in the time of Ptolemy Soter and Philadelphus, and is said to have been the author of a work, entitled, Ολυμπιονικαὶ ἢ Χρονικὰ Πραξίδια, Olympicæ seu Acta Chronica ||. Polybius tells us, that this writer compared the times of the Ephori with the kings of Sparta; and the archons at Athens, and the priestesses of Juno at Argos, with the Olympic vic-

several libraries. Casaub. ad Scalig. epist. 402. 413. Voss. de Hist. Græc. l. i. c. 9. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. iii. c. 8. vol. ii. p. 212.

The fragment, which Fabricius quotes from Berkelius, as the beginning of the Pseudo-Callisthenes, is the production of *another* writer. Bibl. Græc. l. vi. c. 12. vol. xiv. p. 148. Vide Berkel. ad Steph. Byzant. in v. ΒΟΥΚΕΦΑΛΕΙΑ.

\* Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 303.

† Ἀπεστησαν τῶν παλαιοῶν μυθῶν, à priscis fabulis abstinerunt. Diod. Sic. l. iv. § 1. Ἡ δὲ τῶν χρόνων ἀπαγγελία τὸν ἀκριβεστάτον ἐλεγχὸν ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ φέρει, κατὰ φρονεῖν ποιεῖ τῆς ἱστορίας τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας. Et temporum notatio cum exacta supputationis argumenta non admittat, in causâ est ut historiam lector aspernetur. Ibid.

‡ Callisthenes Troicæ bellum [à perpetuâ suâ historiâ separatim.] Cic. Epist. ad Famil. l. v. 12.

|| Strabo.

tors \*. And Diodorus Siculus observes, that he was extremely accurate in the notation of time †.

Yet, notwithstanding this high encomium, he was usually styled γρασοσυλλεγτρια ‡, which implies, that, with respect to his historical compilations, he was a mere old woman. Polybius gives us this character of him : “ His works are filled with dreams, prodigies, and incredible romances ; in short, with the grossest superstition, and the wonderful stories of old women §.” Clemens Alexandrinus likewise represents him as a fabulous writer §.

Eratosthenes was one of the disciples of Callimachus. He was born in the year bef. Chr. 276, and died in 196, or 194, at the age of eighty ¶, or eighty-two \*\*. He was made keeper of the royal library at

\* Ο γὰρ τὰς συγκρίσεις ποιούμενος ἀνεκάθεν τῶν Εφόρων πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ, καὶ τοὺς ἀρχοντας τοὺς ἐν Ἀθῆναις, καὶ τὰς ἱερεῖας τὰς ἐν Ἀργεὶ παραβάλλων πρὸς τοὺς Ὀλυμπιονίκας, οὗτος ἐστὶ. Hic enim ille est, qui ephoros, à primâ institutione, cum regibus Spartanorum comparat ; et archontes Atheniensium et sacerdotes Junonis apud Argivos, cum Olympicis victoribus confert. Valesii Excerpta ex Polyb. l. xii. p. 50.

† Τιμαῖος μὲν οὖν μεγίστην περὶ τῶν χρόνων ἀκριβείαν. Timæus maximam diligentiam adhibuit in exquisitâ temporum notatione. Diod. Sic. l. v. § 1.

‡ Suidas in v. Τιμαῖος.

§ Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀποφάσεσιν, ἐνυπνίων, καὶ τερατῶν, καὶ μύθων ἀπίθανων, καὶ συλλαβῶν, δεισιδαιμονίας ἀγχοῦς, καὶ τερατείας γυναικῶδες, ἐστὶ πληθεύς. In suis verò narrationibus ipse somniis et prodigiis refertus est, et fabulis ab omni fide remotis ; ac postremò degeneri ac muliebri superstitione. Valesii Excerpt. ex Polyb. l. xii. p. 56. Suid. in v. Δεισιδαιμονία.

§ Θεωπομπὴ μὲν καὶ Τιμαῖος μύθους καὶ βλασφημίας συντάττουσιν. Theopompo et Timæo, qui fabulas et maledicta componunt. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 1. p. 316.

¶ Suidas. Confini Fasti Attici, tom. iv. p. 94.

\*\* Lucian. in Macrobiiis. Prid. Connect. vol. iii. p. 182.

Alexandria

Alexandria by Ptolemy Euergetes, on the death of Zenodotus ; and continued in that office to the ninth or the eleventh year of Epiphanes. He wrote a great number of books in different sciences. By the order of Ptolemy [Euergetes] he made a catalogue of the kings, who reigned at Thebes in Egypt, which he collected from the records of that city, and the tradition of the priests. The list extends from Menes to Amurthæus or Amuthantæus, and contains a series of 38 kings, who reigned in succession, during a period of 1076 years. It was preserved by Apollodorus, and is extant in the Chronographia of Syncellus \* ; but its authority is questionable.

The *Ολυμπιονικαι* of Eratosthenes are cited by Diogenes Laertius, and Athenæus † ; and his *Χρονολογια* or *Χρονογραφαι*, by Syncellus, Harpocration, and Dionysius Halicarnassæus ‡. In the opinion of Dionysius, “Eratosthenes used accurate canons” in his Chronography ||.

It may not therefore be improper to subjoin some general principles of his chronology, as they are transmitted to us by Clemens Alexandrinus §.

From the taking of Troy to the return of the	Years.
Heraclidæ - - - - -	80
From that time to the settlement of Ionia -	60

\* Syncell. p. 91—147. —According to the computation of Syncellus, who gives us this catalogue of Eratosthenes, Menes began his reign 2600 years, and Amuthantæus died 1524 years, before the Christian æra.

† Diog. Laert. in v. Emped. l. viii. § 51. Athen. l. iv. c. 13. p. 154.

‡ Syncell. p. 194. Harpoc. in v. *ευνος*. Dionys. Halic. l. i. p. 60.

|| *Εισιν οι κανονες ογκταις, ος Ερατοσθενος καχρηται.* Sunt incorruptæ regulæ, quibus Eratosthenes usus est. Dionys. Halic. loc. cit.

§ Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 402.

↓

From



	Years.
From that time to the guardianship of Lycurgus	159
From that time to the first Olympiad - -	108
From that time to the invasion of Xerxes -	297
From that time to the beginning of the Peloponnesian war - - -	48
From that time to the end of the war - -	27
From that time to the battle at Leuctra *	34
From that time to the death of Philip - -	35
From that time to the death of Alexander -	12

The accuracy of some of these numbers, as they stand in the Stromata of Clemens, is confirmed by a passage of Dionysius Halicarnassensis, from which we learn, that the four hundred and thirty-second year after the destruction of Troy was, according to the canons of Eratosthenes, the first year of the seventh Olympiad †.

As Eratosthenes had the use of the Alexandrian library, he had advantages in his chronological researches, which none of his predecessors enjoyed. But this was long after the year, in which the Parian Chronicle is supposed to have been compiled. That work was engraved in 264, when Eratosthenes was only twelve years of age; and he was not invited from Athens till the year 239 ‡, twenty-five years afterwards. The Chronicle therefore could not be copied from the writings of Eratosthenes. Besides, the computations of

\* *Ετα τετρακοντα τρισσα.*—The Latin translation, in the editions of Sylburgius and Potter, makes it only xxx years: I suppose by mistake.

† Dionys. Halic. loc. cit.

‡ Prid. Connect. vol. iii. p. 121. and Chronol. Table at the end of the fourth volume. Saxius supposes, that Eratosthenes was not appointed keeper of the Alexandrian library, before the year 266. Onomastic. p. 109.



the Chronicle, and that of Eratosthenes, are very different in some important articles, as it will appear hereafter.

Apollodorus, an Athenian, the disciple of Aristarchus the grammarian, and Panætius the philosopher, was the author of several treatises on the fabulous and heroic ages of Greece, particularly the following: 1. *Περὶ Θεῶν*, Of the Gods, a work of considerable extent. 2. *Βιβλιοθηκα*, a genealogical and mythological work. The part of it now remaining, which scarcely consists of three books, ends abruptly with an account of some of the exploits of Theseus. From passages cited by the ancients, the learned Dr. Gale and others infer, that the History of the Gods, and the Bibliotheca, were different productions \*. 3. *Χρονικα* or *Χρονικη Συνταξις* †, *Temporum Ordo & Structura*, extending from the siege of Troy to the time when the author wrote, which was about the year bef. Chr. 140, or something later ‡, This work is said to have been composed in tragiambic verse ||.

\* Errant, qui [Bibliothecam] idem opus cum libris *Περὶ Θεῶν* faciunt. Galei Dissert. de Script. Mythol. c. 5.—Dr. Gale likewise proves, that the Bibliotheca is not an *EPITOME* of the History of the Gods, as some writers have supposed. Ibid.

† Diod. Sic. l. xiii. p. 222.

‡ Apollodorus mentions the death of Carneades, in the CLXII. Olympiad, bef. Chr. 129. Diog. Laert. l. iv. § 65.

*Συντάξετα περὶ [απο] τῆς Τρωϊκῆς ἀλώσεως,  
Χρονογραφίαν περιέχουσαν ἀχρεὶ τοῦ νῦν βίου.*

*Conscripsit à Trojæ excidio,  
Chronographiam versibus descriptam ad hoc usque  
tempus.*

Marc. Heracl. sive Scymni Chii Perieg. v. 22.

This author wrote in the year bef. Chr. 132. Corsini *Fast. Attici*, tom. iv. p. 107.

|| A. Gellius, l. xvii. c. 4. cites three verses from the *Chronica* of Apollodorus.

The

The writings of Apollodorus naturally suggest the two following observations :

1. Though the Bibliotheca was written 120 years after the date of the Parian Chronicle, it does not contain the smallest traces of a systematical chronology.

2. The chronicle of Apollodorus is quoted by many eminent writers of antiquity \* ; while that of Paros, which comprehends a more extensive period, is entirely unnoticed.

About the same time † Polybius wrote his Universal History ‡, originally consisting of forty books, of which five only are now remaining, with extracts and fragments of some others. The first and second books form a sort of introduction to the rest. In the third the author enters upon his principal subject, which was a history of the most considerable transactions of the Romans, and other nations, from the year 220, or the commencement of the second Carthaginian war, to the fall of the Macedonian empire, in 168 ||.

Polybius is the most ancient writer now extant, that has adopted the method of ascertaining the dates of civil and military transactions by the Olympiads. But his history, excepting the short sketches contained in the

\* Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Plutarch, Phlegon, A. Gellius, Lucian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Diogenes Laertius *passim*, Eusebius, Stephanus Byzantinus, &c.

† Polybius was born bef. Chr. 205 years, and died 123.

‡ Ἱστορικὴ καθολικὴ. Polyb. l. ii. c. 37.

|| Strabo informs us, that Polybius was present at the burning of Corinth by L. Mummius, in the year 146 ; that he had given an account of that event in his history ; and particularly lamented the destruction, which was made by the Roman soldiers, of many beautiful pictures, and other works of ingenuity, when they plundered the city. Strab. l. viii. p. 584.

The fifth book of Polybius ends with the cxi Olympiad, bef. Chr. 217.

two preliminary books, included the events of only 53 years, many of which happened within the compass of his own life, and does not display any great extent of chronological science.

About this time chronology began to assume a new form, and to be established on more solid, regular, and scientific principles. The Greek historians, in general, made use of the Olympiads in the computation of time. Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, and others, will shew us, how this epocha was regularly continued in subsequent ages. But as no records had been kept, before the establishment of the Olympiads, in the time of Coræbus; and no great accuracy observed in the Olympic catalogues, till they began to be applied to historical purposes, the transactions of preceding ages still remained in a state of obscurity and confusion; and all that the ablest chronologers could afterwards accomplish, was a precarious system, founded on the loose calculations, or the arbitrary assertions, of more ancient authors.

I am very sensible, that several writers, besides those I have mentioned, published Olympic catalogues; particularly Aristotle, Demetrius Phalereus, Philochorus, Aristarchus, Steficlides, Hippostratus, Phlegon, &c. \*

But

\* Aristotle. *ολυμπιονικαι*, Olympicæ. Diog. Laert. in v. Arist. l. v. § 26.

Demetrius Phalereus. *των Αρχοντων Αναγραφη*, Archontum Recensio. Diog. Laert. in v. Thal. l. i. § 22. See below, chap. x.

Philochorus. This writer was an Athenian, and lived about 200 years bef. Chr. Vid. Suid.

Aristarchus. *ὁ των Ολυμπιασιν εξηγητης*, Olympiadum enarrator. Pausan. l. v. c. 20.

Steficlides. *των Αρχοντων και Ολυμπιονικων Αναγραφη*. Diog. Laert. in v. Xenoph. l. ii. § 56.

Hippostratus. v. Jonsf. de Script. Hist. Phil. l. iv. § 41.

Phlegon.

But from what has been observed in the writings of the Greeks, from Herodotus to Polybius, we can find no traces of a regular scientific chronology.

Let us consider the sentiments of the ancients on this subject.

Phlegon. Ολυμπιονικων και χρονικων συναγωγη, Olympionicarum & Chronicorum Sylloge. Phot. cod. 271



C H A P. VI.

**J**ULIUS Africanus, in this *Χρονογραφία*, which extends from the creation to the year after Christ 221, asserts, “that the Greeks had no accurate history before the Olympiads; and that all their accounts of preceding ages are confused and inconsistent \*.”

Justin Martyr likewise observes, “that the Greeks had no accurate history before the Olympiads †.” Justin wrote about the year 140.

Plutarch, an author of great learning and judgement, ventures no farther into Grecian antiquity, than the time of Theseus. When he attempts to give his readers the history of that hero, he says, “As geographers throw into the extremities of their maps those countries, which are unknown to them; remarking at the same time, that all beyond is nothing but hills of sand, and haunts of wild beasts, frozen seas, marshes, and mountains, inaccessible to human courage and industry; so in comparing the lives of illustrious men, when I have passed through the periods of time, which may be described with probability, and where history may find a

\* *Μεχρι μεν Ολυμπιαδων, ουδεν ακριβες ιστορηται τοις Έλλησι, παντων συγκεχυμενων, και κατα μηδεν αυτοις των πρεσβυτου συμφαινουντων.* Ante quidem Olympiades nihil certi à Græcis in historiâ traditur, omnibus confusis, nec ullâ ex parte sibi antea consentientibus. Afric. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. x. c. 10. Syncell. p. 154.—Africanus died about the year of Christ 232. Cave.

† *Ότι ουδεν Έλλησι προ των Ολυμπιαδων ακριβες ιστορηται.* Nihil à Græcis ante Olympiades, accuratè scriptum esse. Just. Mart. ad Græc. Cohort. p. 13. edit. 1686.—Justin was born about the year 89, and died in 164. Fabricius.

## THE PARIAN CHRONICLE. 101

sure footing in facts, I may say of the remoter ages, that all beyond is full of prodigy and fiction, the region of poets and fabulists, wrapt in clouds, and unworthy of belief \*.”

Plutarch's *ne plus ultra* is not much more than half a century before the siege of Troy; for Theseus is said to have carried away Hellen from Sparta, about 24 years before that event †.

This excellent writer takes notice of the inconsistencies of the Greek historians in many points of chronology, concerning some of the most illustrious characters, and the most important transactions of later times, in which we might have expected a general agreement. Thus, he says, “there is nothing but uncertainty and contradiction in the accounts, which historians have given us of Lycurgus, the celebrated Spartan lawgiver. Some say, he was contemporary with Iphitus, and joined with him in settling the cessation of arms, during the Olympic games ‡. Aristotle the philosopher is of this opinion, and endeavours to support it by an Olympic disc, on which the name of Lycurgus was inscribed.

\* Plut. in v. Thesei, p. 1.—Plutarch wrote about the year a. d. 120.

† Sir Isaac Newton places the birth of Theseus 74 years before the siege of Troy. Chron. an. 938.

‡ The Olympic games are supposed to have been first instituted by the Idæan Hercules, in the fabulous ages of Greece. Diod. Sic. l. v. p. 230. After many interruptions they were restored by Iphitus, prince of Elis, 884 years bef. Chr. the year in which Lycurgus gave his laws to the Lacedæmonians. But the names of the victors were not recorded, till the xxviii Olympiad, in the year 776, when Corcebus of Elis was victor in the race. This was the first Olympiad, which the Greeks used in their chronological computations; yet these Olympiads are confounded by several authors. Aristod. apud Syncell. p. 196. Athen. l. xiv. p. 635. Pausan. l. v. c. 4.

Others, as Eratosthenes and Apollodorus \*, computing the time by the succession of the Spartan kings, place him much earlier than the first Olympiad †.”

In another place he says, “Some authors think they can prove by chronological arguments, that the story, concerning the interview between Solon and Cræsus, is a fiction. But a story so famous, attested by such a number of witnesses, and, what still more deserves to be considered, so agreeable to Solon’s character, and so worthy of his magnanimity and wisdom, should not, in my opinion, be rejected, upon a pretence of its not agreeing with some chronological canons ‡, as they are called, which thousands continue to this day endeavouring to correct, without being able to bring them to any consistency ||.”

In this instance, we find the date of a most important transaction, in the most polished state of Greece, the legislation of Solon at Athens, a subject of dispute and uncertainty.

Josephus asserts, that the ancient Greek writers destroy one another’s credit; that the genealogies of Hesiod are corrected by Acusilaus §; that Acusilaus is

\* Eratosthenes placed the legislation of Lycurgus 299 years after the siege of Troy; that is, bef. Chr. 884. And Apollodorus agreed with him in this computation. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 402.

† Plut. in v. Lycurgi, § 1.

‡ Plutarch seems to allude to the canons of Eratosthenes.

|| Plut. in v. Solonis, p. 93.—According to Corsini, Solon was archon in 594; went into Lydia, during the tyranny of Pisistratus, in 560; and died the year following. Fasti Attici, tom. iii. p. 99. But see A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21. Diog. Laert. l. i. § 59.

§ Clemens Alexandrinus informs us, that Eumelus and Acusilaus turned some of Hesiod’s poems into prose, and then published them as their own compositions. Strom. l. vi. § 2. p. 752.



condemned by Hellenicus, Hellenicus accused of falsehood by Ephorus, Ephorus by Timæus, Timæus by his successors, and Herodotus by all the world \*.

Varro, who is applauded by Cicero, Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Seneca, and Quintilian †, for his profound learning and knowledge of antiquities, divided the time, anterior to his own age, into three parts. “The first,” he says, “extends from the beginning of the world to the Ogygian deluge ‡; and may be called, *αδηλον*, the obscure or unknown period. The second extends from the deluge to the first Olympiad, and is called *μυθικον*, fabulous. The third extends from the first Olympiad to the present time, and is called *ιστορικον*, the historic æra ||.”

Thucydides, in the beginning of his history, remarks, that “the transactions of an earlier date [than the Peloponnesian war] and those which were still more ancient, could not, through length of time, be adequately known §.”

But

\* *Ἡροδοτον δε παντες.* Jos. cont. Ap. l. i. § 3.—Josephus was born A. D. 37, and brought down his Antiquities to the year 94; but how long he lived afterwards is not known. Lib. xx. sub fin.

† Cicero de claris Orat. § 60. Dionys. Halic. l. ii. p. 92. Sen. Consol. ad Helv. c. 8. Quint. l. x. 1.

‡ Ant. Chr. 1796. Banier.

|| Varro tria discrimina temporum esse tradit. Primum, ab hominum principio ad cataclysinum priorem, quod propter ignorantiam vocetur *αδηλον*. Secundum, à cataclyfino priore ad Olympiadem primam; quod, quia in eo multa fabulosa referuntur, *μυθικον* nominatur. Tertium, à primâ Olympiade ad nos, quod dicitur *ιστορικον*, quia res in eo gestæ, veris historiis continentur. Varronis Fragm. p. 219. Censor. de Die Nat. c. 21. Varro diad. Euf. Chr. 26 years. Eusebius.

§ *Τα προ αυτων, και τα επι πελοποννησικα, σε οτι μιν ιστορικον, δια χρονον πολλον, αδυναταν ην.* Quæ ante [motus Peloponnesiacos gesta] et quæ

etiam



But the most important observation on this subject occurs in Diodorus Siculus, who informs us, that, when he undertook to write his Historical Library, “ he travelled through many parts of Europe and Asia, in order to view those places, which he had occasion to mention, and to examine every thing, which might be of service to him in his undertaking; and that he spent thirty years in composing this work \*.”

Yet after all his enquiries he declares, that “ he did not attempt to circumscribe those times, which preceded the Trojan war, because he could find no *PARAPEGMA*, on which he could place any dependence †.”

In this passage the word *PARAPEGMA* has been variously interpreted. The Latin translators, Rhodoman and Wesselingius, render it, “ certitudinis fulcrum.” Sir Isaac Newton accordingly translates *μηδεν παραπηγμα πιστευομενον*, “ no certain foundation to rely upon.” Scalliger calls *parapegma*, *tempus certum & definitum*; and adds, “ id autem duplex est, undè et quò. Hoc est, undè rationes temporum deducuntur, et quò referuntur.” Marsham styles it, *terminus fixus*; Stillingfleet, “ a certain fixed epocha, or a certain fixed period of

*etiam antiquiora, liquidò investigari, propter temporis longinquitatem, non potuerunt. Thucyd. l. i. § 1.*

\* Τριακοντα μεν ετη περι αυτην επραγματευθημεν, μετα δε πολλης κακοπαθειας και κινδυνων επληθεμεν πολλην της τε Ασιας και της Ευρωπης, ινα των αναγκαιοτατων, και πλειστων μερων αυτοπται γενηθωμεν. *Triginta annorum operam in id [argumentum] contulimus, magnamque Asiæ & Europæ partem, non absque periculis & ærumnis, perlustravimus; ut pleraque, et maximè instituto huic necessaria, loca inspiceremus ipsi. Diod. in Procem. Just. Mart. Cohort. ad Græc. p. 10. Diodorus flourished bef. Chr. 60 years. Blount.*

† Τους μεν [χρονους] προ των Τρωϊκων ου διοριζομεθα βεβαιως, δια το μηδεν ΠΑΡΑΠΗΓΜΑ παρειληφεναι περι τουτων πιστευομενον. *Quæ Troïca præcesserunt, non definimus certo spatio; quia nullum sumi potest PARAPEGMA, cui fidendum. Diod. in Procem. p. 5.*

time.”

time \*.” Suidas explains it by the word *κανων*, regula. But Salmasius censures the interpreters of Diodorus, and other learned men, for their ignorance and hallucination, with respect to this term, and then proceeds to define it in this manner: “Interpretes Diodori firmentum exponunt. Scaliger ad Eusebium, quod alii *εποχην*, Cenforinus titulum vocat, id Diodoro dici *παραπνημα*, hoc est, terminum fixum et hærentem. *Παραπνημα* propriè est quicquid adfigitur. Hinc *παραπνηματα* tabulæ dicebantur adfixæ columnis, aut pilis, in quibus leges, aut alia publica monumenta incidebantur . . . . *Παραπνημα ιστορικον* aut *μυθικον* dicitur series historiarum vel fabularum, secundum ordinem temporum digesta. Et hõc sensu planè accipiendum est in illis Diodori verbis †.”

This learned commentator, if I rightly comprehend his idea, supposes *parapegma* to signify what we call a chronological table.

To these interpretations I shall subjoin the sentiments of Vossius.

“Diodorus Siculus solùm extendit [tempus *μυθικον*] usque ad bellum Trojanum; atque addit, ante ea tempora nihil certi haberi, propterea quòd nullum sit *παραπνημα* περι τούτων πιστευομενον. Nempe astrologi quidem habent tabulas suas, quæ *παραπνηματα* vocantur, ubi siderum ortus et occasus, atque tempestates, ordine annotantur; cujusmodi tabulas sequi tutò licet. At non historici similiter ante Trojana tempora, ut hic Diodorus ait, habent sua quoque *παραπνηματα* πιστευομενα, ubi series temporum annotetur. Extabant quidem Arctinus, Eumelus, Lesches, alii poetæ cyclici; sed negat

\* Newton's Chron. c. 1. Scal. ad Euseb. Chron. proleg. p. vi. Ejusdem Animad. p. 71. Marston. Canon. Chron. p. 14. 329. edit. 1672. Stillingfl. Orig. Sacrae, b. i. c. 5, 6.

† Salmas. Plin. Exercit. p. 860.

hos παραπνημα esse, cui sedem [fidem] habere semper possis, propter tot fabulas. Varro extendit μυθικον tempus ulteriùs ; nimirum usque ad primam Olympiadem \*.”

If we understand the word *parapegma* of a chronological table, as Salmasius and Vossius explain it, such a table must consist of certain fixed periods or epochas ; these epochas must be determined by canons or rules ; and these canons or rules must be the basis, upon which a chronological system is founded. These different interpretations therefore seem to be, in fact, equivalent.

But in whatever sense we understand this term, the assertion of Diodorus is extremely unfavourable to the credit of the Parian Chronicle. For we must either suppose, that it was not EXISTING in the time of Diodorus, which at once decides the question ; or, that Diodorus had not heard of it, which is scarcely credible, considering his abilities, and the pains he took to collect information from every quarter ; or, lastly, that he did not think it πιστευόμενον, worthy of credit ; which will hardly be admitted by the advocates for the Arundelian Marbles.

The same inference may be drawn from the foregoing remarks of Africanus, Justin Martyr, Plutarch, Josephus, Varro, and Thucydides ; for all these writers agree, that the earlier periods of the Grecian history were involved in darkness and confusion.

But, if the Parian chronologer could ascertain the dates of the most important events, which happened in Greece, five, six, seven, eight hundred years before the Olympiads ; such as, the first establishment of the kingdom of Attica by Cecrops, the deluge in the time

\* G. I. Vossii Chron. Sacrae Isagoge. c. 2. p. 7. edit. 1659.

De Parapegmate, vid. Vitruv. l. ix. 7. Gemini Isagog. c. 15. Usser. de Maced. Anno Solari, c. 6, 7. Menagii Observ. in Diog. Laert. l. ix. § 48.



of Deucalion, the coming of Danaus into Peloponnesus, the arrival of Cadmus in Bœotia, the siege of Troy, &c. with a particularity which we scarcely find in a modern history, there could be no want of light or information, no want of *parapegmata*, *epochas*, *canons*, or *chronological tables* : consequently, the complaints of all the writers above-mentioned, and many others, which might be alleged, are groundless and absurd.

This is a flagrant imputation on the knowledge, or the integrity, of those respectable authors ; but it is obviated at once on a supposition, that the Parian Chronicle is a modern compilation.

Thucydides, I know, lived 140 years before the Chronicle is said to have been written ; but if Thucydides, as well as other writers, complained, that there was nothing but uncertainty in the earlier periods of the Grecian history, from whence can we suppose the author of this inscription collected such a clear, determinate, and comprehensive system of chronology ?

If he had any sources of information, which were unknown to succeeding writers, how happens it, that they should all of them overlook this most considerable, most exact, most creditable author ? Why did they omit this ancient account of their early ages ? Why did they not copy his most memorable *epochas* ? Why did they not produce his authority ? or, at least, why did they not mention his opinion ? Surely nothing, to all appearance, could be more elaborate, more important, or of higher authority, than a chronological table, which was thought worthy of being engraved on marble !—Yet, on this occasion, as we shall soon find, all the writers of antiquity are perfectly silent !



## C H A P. VII.

V. **T**HE silence of the ancients, with respect to the Parian Chronicle, is by no means a circumstance in its favour.

The learned and judicious Le Clerc, treating of the proper means of detecting supposititious books, among other rules for that purpose, lays down the following aphorism.

“Those writings, which are neither named in ancient catalogues, nor mentioned by any writer in the same age, or in ages immediately following, are, for the most part, to be accounted fictitious, or, at least, may be justly suspected \*.”

It is natural to suppose, that a short, insignificant inscription, like most of those which are preserved in the collections of Gruter, Reinesius, Gudius, Spon, and others, might have lain exposed to public view for many ages, without being particularly noticed by historians or antiquaries. But the Parian Chronicle is not a small inscription, of no importance in the republic of letters; it is not an inscription, which might have been concealed in a private library, or a cabinet, like a volume in manuscript. But it is a curious, learned, and comprehensive system of chronology, inscribed at a con-

\* Scripta, quorum nulla mentio in priscis catalogis, quæ nec memorata sunt ab ullo scriptore sequentium proximè sæculorum, ut plurimum aut ficta judicanda sunt, aut minimum suspecta habenda. Cler. Art. Crit. p. iii. § 2. c. 3.—In this passage the author alludes to such catalogues as we find in Diogenes Laertius, or in A. Gellius. l. iii. 5.

considerable expence on a tablet of marble, comprehending a detail of the principal epochas of Greece, during a period of 1300 years.

“In this inscription,” says Prideaux, “we have more events in the early ages of Greece, specified and recorded, than are to be found in almost all the writers of antiquity \*.” The epochas of Cecrops, Deucalion, Hellen †, Cadmus, Danaus, Minos, Triptolemus, Hesiod, Homer, and others, about which the learned are still in doubt, are here exactly ascertained.

Here the question, which has been a thousand times debated, whether Homer or Hesiod is the more ancient author, is precisely determined. Here likewise the year, the month, and the day of the month, in which Troy was taken, is particularly specified.

These are such WONDERFUL DISCOVERIES in ancient history, that if this Chronicle had existed 264 years before the birth of Christ, and more especially, if it had been compiled by PUBLIC AUTHORITY, or even KNOWN at Paros, it must have excited a general attention, and would certainly have been copied, or cited, or praised, or censured, or mentioned, by some writers of succeeding times.

But neither Strabo, Pliny, Pausanias, nor Athenæus, who mention the most remarkable curiosities of different countries; neither Apollodorus, Diodorus Siculus, Tatian, Clemens Alexandrinus †, nor Eusebius,

\* In uno horum, plura de antiquis Græcorum temporibus, quàm in omnibus ferè libris, habes explicata. Prid. Marin. Oxon. præf. p. v.

† From this Hellen the Greeks were called Hellenes. Apollod. l. i. c. 7. al. 6.

‡ Tatian cites fifteen, and Clemens Alexandrinus ten ancient writers, concerning a point of chronology, namely, the age of Homer, within the compass of two pages. Tatian. § 48. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 385.

who professedly treat of the fabulous ages of Greece, take the least notice of this wonderful monument of ancient learning. In short, we do not find in any writer of antiquity, either poet or historian, geographer or chronologer, mythologist or scholiast, the most distant allusion to the Parian Chronicle.

We have indeed lost the works of many ancient authors; yet perhaps there never appeared a writer of any reputation, either in Greece or Rome, in all the ages of classical antiquity, whose name, and some account of his writings, have not been transmitted to the present age. If this observation be not strictly true, the exceptions are few and inconsiderable.

It was such a common practice among the ancients, to mention the works of their predecessors, that in many books we find references and allusions to three, four, five, six, or seven hundred different authors of every denomination.

Above 170 authors are mentioned by Pausanias, 200 by A. Gellius, 320 by Servius, 340 by Diogenes Laertius, 350 in the Greek Scholia to Aristophanes, 430 by the two Senecas, 450 by Eustathius, 450 by Quintilian, 530 by Plutarch, 580 by Clemens Alexandrinus, 700 by Pliny, 700 by Athenæus, and a proportionable number by many other classic writers; but not a syllable of the learned Parian, or of his elaborate system of Grecian chronology.

At last, after it had existed above 1800 years, without being either named or cited, it is dug out of the ground, and brought to Europe in triumph; it is explained, quoted, applauded \*, by critics and commentators. In a word, it is deposited in the bosom of our

\* Vix aliud est in re literariâ, augustius, antiquius, utilius. Maiusculæ, Marin. Arund. dedic. p. i.

## THE PARIAN CHRONICLE. 111

Alma Mater, and esteemed *κτῆμα ες αἰ,* “a glorious and everlasting acquisition.”

Under these circumstances, it will be impossible to account for the profound silence of the ancients, and their gross inattention to a writer, who now excites the curiosity and admiration of the literary world, and professes to unravel all the chronological perplexities of the fabulous and heroic ages of Greece,

C H A P.



## C H A P. VIII.

**T**HERE are three objections, which may be alleged against the preceding argument.

First, as there were many chronological writers among the Greeks, the author of the Parian Chronicle might have been one of them, and cited under his proper name, without any reference to the inscription.

Secondly, this Chronicle has been ascribed to Demetrius Phalereus.

Thirdly, the works of some eminent writers of antiquity, such as Phædrus and Q. Curtius, lay in obscurity for many centuries, and were not discovered till later ages.

The supposition, on which the first of these objections is founded, is extremely improbable. The ancients almost always specified the works of their predecessors, which they had occasion to quote. Thus, Diogenes Laertius refers to Demetrius Phalereus, *εν τη των Αρχοντων Αναγραφη*; to Apollodorus, *εν Χρονικοις*; to Eratosthenes, *εν τοις Ολυμπικηκαις*; to Timæus, *εν δεκατη Ιστοριων*, &c.

In the same manner, the Parian Chronicle would certainly have been mentioned under some distinguishing title, if it had been noticed or cited by the writers of antiquity.

But let us enquire, how far the chronology of the learned Parian corresponds with that of the ancients, in two or three instances of the utmost notoriety, the epocha of the Trojan war, and the age of Homer.

The

The EPOCHA of the TROJAN WAR.

Bef. Chr.

Sofibius reckoned, from the destruction of Troy to the first Olympiad, 395 years \*. -

1171

Eratosthenes computed, from the taking of Troy to the return of the Heraclidæ, 80 years; from thence to the colonization of Ionia, 60 years; from thence to the tutelary government of Lycurgus, 159 years; and from thence to the commencement of the Olympiads, 108 years; in all 407 †. -

1183

Dionysius Argivus supposed, that Troy was taken in the eighteenth year of the reign of Agamemnon, and the first of Demophon ‡. - - -

1183

P. Cato placed the building of Rome, in the first year of the seventh Olympiad, 432

\* Apud Censorin. c. 21.—The passage in Censorinus, on which some of the following computations depend, is confused and erroneous. The Cambridge edition in 1695, and Havercamp's in 1767, give it in this manner :

Secundum [tempus] non planè quidem scitur; sed tamen ad mille circiter et 100 annos esse creditur: à priori scilicet cataclysmo, quem Ogygium dicunt, *ad Inachi regnum*, anni circiter cccc. hinc ad Olympiadem primam paulo plus cccc... Et quidem Sofibius scripsit esse cccxcv, &c.

The following alteration will perhaps give us a clear and consistent idea of the author's calculations.—Sed tamen ad *mille* circiter annos esse creditur à priori scilicet cataclysmo, quem Ogygium dicunt, *ad Ilii excidium*, anni circiter 100. Hinc ad Olympiadem primam paulo plus cccc, &c. See Jackson's Chron. Antiq. vol. iii. p. 330.

† Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 402.—Eratosthenes autem septem et cccc. Censor. loc. cit.

‡ Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 381. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 376. Præp. Evang. l. x. c. 12. p. 498.

Q

years

years after the Trojan war *. From this number deduct 25 years for the Olympiads, preceding the foundation of the city, and the remainder will be 407. - -	Bef. Chr.   1183
Dionysius of Halicarnassus follows the computation of Cato. - - -	1183
Diodorus Siculus computes 779 years, from the taking of Troy to the end of the ninety-third Olympiad †; and consequently, to the first Olympiad, 407 years. - -	1183
Tatian places the Trojan war 407 years before the Olympiads ‡. - - -	1183
Eusebius tells us, that from the taking of Troy to the first Olympiad, there were 406 years; or, according to Scaliger, 407   . - - -	1183
Apollodorus reckoned, from the Trojan war to the return of the Heraclidæ, 80 years; and from thence to the first Olympiad, 328 years §. - - -	1184
Solinus places the restoration of the Olympic games, in the four hundred and eighth year after the destruction of Troy ¶. - - -	1184
The Greek chronologists, as Eusebius informs us, computed 408 years from the siege of Troy to the first Olympiad **. - -	1184
Censorinus reckons, from the destruction	

\* Dion. Halic. l. i. p. 60.

† Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 235.

‡ Tatian. ad Græc. § 64.

|| Euseb. Chron. p. 93. Scal. Animadv. p. 53..

§ Diod. Sic. l. i. p. 5, 6.

¶ Solin. c. i. § 28. edit. Goezii, 1777.

\*\* Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. x. c. 9. p. 484.

of Troy to the first Olympiad, a little more than 400 years *.	Bef. Chr.
- - - - -	118*
Arctes Dyrrhachinus makes this interval 414 years †.	1190
- - - - -	
Paterculus reckons 437 years from the taking of Troy to the building of Rome, 22 years after the commencement of the Olympiads ‡.	1191
- - - - -	
Timæus computed, from the destruction of Troy to the first Olympiad, 417 years   .	1193
- - - - -	
Dicæarchus reckoned, from the reign of Nilus to the first Olympiad, 436 years §.—By the reign of Nilus, Sir John Marsham says, Dicæarchus indicates the time of the Trojan war.	1212
- - - - -	
The author of the Life of Homer, ascribed to Herodotus, reckons, from the Trojan war to the birth of that poet, 168 years; from thence to the expedition of Xerxes into Greece in 480, 622 years ¶.	1270
- - - - -	
Duris Samius, who lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, computed from the destruction of Troy to Alexander's expedi-	

\* Cenfor. loc. cit.—This calculation depends on the correction proposed in a former note.

† Apud Cenforin. loc. cit.—In the Cambridge edition, and that of Havercamp, &c. the number is *IOXIII*; but this seems to be a mistake instead of *CDXIII*.

‡ V. Patere. l. i. c. 8.—There is probably an error in the text of Paterculus.

|| Apud Cenforin. loc. cit.

§ Apud Schol. in Apoll. Argon. l. iv. v. 276. p. 412. edit. 1641.—Per regnum Nili belli Trojani tempora Dicæarchus designat. Marsh. Can. Chron. sec. x. p. 249.—Dicæarchus was one of Aristotle's disciples.

¶ Vita Homeri inter Herod. Op. § 38.



tion into Asia, in the year bef. Chr. 335,	Bef. Chr.
1000 years. *	1335
The PARIAN CHRONICLE places the de-	
struction of Troy before the Olympic æra,	
433 years.	1209

Several writers acquaint us with the month, and the day of the month, on which Troy was taken. Some placed this event on the twenty-third day of Scirrophorion †; Ægias or Agis, and Dercylus, on the twenty-third of Panemus ‡; Hellanicus and Dionysius Argivus on the twelfth of Thargelion ||; Dionysius Halicarnassæus, an ancient scholiast on Euripides, and others, on the twenty-third of that month §; Ephorus, Callisthenes, Damastes, and Philarchus, on the twenty-fourth ¶.

The

\* Apud. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 403.

† Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 381. Vid. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 376.

‡ Clem. Alex. loc. cit.—According to Corsini, Panemus, among the Corinthians, coincided with Hecatombæon or July; and among the Macedonians, with Scirrophorion or June. Corsini Dissert. Agonist. p. 159. Fast. Attic. Dissert. iii. § 20, 21.

|| Clem. Alex. loc. cit.

§ Ογδοη φθινοντος μηνος Θαργηλιωνος, octavâ definentis Thargelionis die; that is, the eighth from the end, or the twenty-third day of the month. Dionys. Halic. l. i. p. 51. Schol. ad Eurip. Hecub. v. 914. apud Scal. Emend. Temp. l. v. p. 378. Clem. Alex. loc. cit.

¶ Τη εβδομη φθινοντος, septimâ definentis die, or the twenty-fourth. Plut. in v. Camilli. p. 138.

Before the first year of the LXXXVII Olympiad, that is, bef. Chr. 432, the Athenians, according to Corsini, began their year from the winter solstice, with the month Gamelion; afterwards from the summer solstice, with Hecatombæon. Their year had twelve months, consisting of 30 and 29 days alternately. This learned writer ranges them in the following order: Hecatombæon, Metagitnion, Boëdromion, Pyanepsion, Mæmacterion, Posideon, Gamelion,

The PARIAN CHRONICLE likewise places it on the twenty-fourth of Thargelion.

With respect to the sentiments of modern chronologers, concerning the time of this event, it may be sufficient to observe, that there are two opinions, transmitted to us by the ancients, which nearly coincide, and carry with them the greatest probability. The one is adopted by Scaliger \*, and his followers, Calvisius, Emmius, &c. who place it in the year bef. Chr. 1183; the other, by Petavius, Capellus, Usher, Strauchius, &c. who place it in 1184.

Some of the Greek writers, as we have already observed, have asserted, that Troy was taken on the twenty-third, and others, on the twenty-fourth of Thargelion. In order to adjust this dispute, modern chronologists have supposed, that the city was taken in the night, between the twenty-third and the twenty-fourth †. But this, I apprehend, is rather an imaginary, than a real exactness.

lion, Anthesterion, Elaphebolion, Munychion, Thargelion, Scirophorion, which nearly corresponded with July, August, September, October, &c. Corsini Dissert. Agonist. p. 159. Fast. Attic. Dissert. ii. § 8. 22. 29. &c. Id. tom. iii. Proleg. p. xxviii.

\* Emend. Temp. l. v. p. 379. Canon. Isag. l. iii. p. 289.

† Capellus colligit *ἡμεραν ἀλωσιν* contigisse inter Junii decimum tertium, et decimum quartum; nocte scilicet, quæ media fuit inter lunam 23 et 24, hoc est, inter *ἐβδομην φθινοντος* et *ογδον φθινοντος* Thargelionis. Simsonii Chron. p. 330.

Facile diffidium illud componi poterit, siue quod nox illa, quæ urbs incensa ac direpta fuit, tum ad vigesimam tertiam, quæ præcesserat, tum ad vigesimam quartam proximè insequentem diem referri possit; siue quod in Thargelione mense dies aliqua, juxta Metonis leges, exempta concipiatur; adeoque una eademque dies, quæ verè vigesima tertia fuerat, atque *ογδον φθινοντος*, à Dionysio, et Clemente quoque Alexandrino vocata fuit, vigesima quarta ab aliis appellari potuerit, si exemptilis ipsa in dierum numero computetur. Corsini Fast. Attic. Dissert. ii. p. 86.

Let us now see, how the hypothesis of the Parian Chronicle corresponds with the sentiments of the foregoing writers, in this and other articles.

Eratoſthenes, Dionyſius Argivus, Cato, Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, Diodorus, Tatian, and Eusebius, make an interval, between the Trojan war and the Olympiads, of 407 years ; other authors, an interval of 408.

The compiler of the Parian Chronicle makes the same interval consist of 433 years ; in which he differs from the former 26, and from the latter 25 years.

He supposes, that Troy was taken 1209 years before the Christian æra, on the twenty-fourth day of Thargelion ; and, in this particular, he agrees with Ephorus, Callisthenes, Damastes, and Philarchus. But Plutarch, who gives us the sentiments of these writers, does not mention the year, in which they placed that event.

The learned Petavius, having examined the circumstances, recorded by the ancients, relative to the year, the month, and the day, on which Troy was taken ; and compared those circumstances with the lunations, by which the Grecian months were regulated, observes, that every thing coincides with the year of the Julian period 3530, bef. Chr. 1184 ; but that the Arundelian marbles, which place that event on the twenty-fourth day of Thargelion, in the year of the J. P. 3505, or bef. Chr. 1209, totally confound all the accounts of the ancients \*.

Isocrates reckoned, that the Athenian constitution

\* Igitur anno Per. Jul. 3530, ante Christianam æram 1184, nobilissimum illud excidium incidit. Marmora Arundelliana idem eo anno vindicant, qui sit Per. Jul. 3505, Thargelionis ἐβδόμεν φθινορτος, hoc est, 24. die : quod antiquorum omnium rationes CONTURBAT. Ration. Temp. par. ii. l. ii. c. 10. Ibid. p. i. l. i. c. 12.



had subsisted from its first establishment by Cecrops, to the usurpation of Pisistratus, *οὐκ ἐλάττω χιλίων ἐτῶν*, not less than a thousand years \*. The Chronicle makes this period 1021 years.

It is observed by Selden, that the beginning of the reign of Cecrops is placed 26 years sooner by the author of the Chronicle, than it is by Eusebius †; and that there is very seldom any greater agreement between them, before the appointment of the annual archons. It may not therefore be improper to illustrate this observation by a few examples.

The difference between the Parian Chronicle and Eusebius, in the date of some memorable occurrences.

Cecrops began to reign in Attica,	P. C.	Euf.	Diff.
bef. Chr. - - -	1582	1556	26
Deucalion began to reign at Lyco-			
ria - - -	1574	1541	33
Deucalion's deluge - - -	1529	1527	2
Cadmus builds Cadmea - - -	1519	1455	64
Danaus arrives in Greece - - -	1511	1474	37
Erichthonius celebrates the Pana-			
thenæa - - -	1506	1474	32
Theseus reforms the government of			
Athens - - -	1259	1233	26
The Nemean games instituted - - -	1251	1232	19
Mnestheus began to reign at Athens	1230	1204	26
Troy taken - - -	1209	1183	26

\* Orat. Panath. p. 409. edit. Cantab. 1686.—Isocrates was born 436 years, and wrote his Panathenaic oration 343 years, before Christ.

† *Epocha hæc recentior est Eusebio, annis xxvi. Nec minor firmè consensus est inter eum et nostrum, ante annuorum archontum initia, seu Periodi Julianæ annum 4030. Seld. Marm. Arund. p. 92.*



Phædon invents weights and mea- sures - - -	P. C.	Euf.	Diff.
Creon made annual archon - - -	895	800	95
Terpander - - -	684	684	—
Cyrus takes Sardes - - -	645	646	1
Battle at Marathon - - -	542	549	7
Sea-fight at Salamis - - -	491	491	—
Gelo seizes the kingdom of Syracuse	481	480	1
	479	487	8

Thus far we do not find any exact and uniform correspondence, between the Parian Chronicle and any writer of antiquity, with which we are acquainted.

## CHAP. IX.

## The AGE of HOMER.

Bef. Chr.

**T**HEOPOMPUS conceived, that Homer lived 500 years after the warriors, who were present at the siege of Troy. Others, mentioned by Tatian, were of the same opinion \*. - - -

684

Euphorion imagined, that Homer lived in the time of Gyges, who, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, began to reign in the eighteenth Olympiad †. - - -

708

Some writers, mentioned by Eusebius, place him 400 years after the destruction of Troy ‡. - - -

784

Sosibius made Homer flourish 90 years before the Olympiads ||. - - -

866

Euphorbus, or Ephorus, 124 years before the building of Rome §. - - -

877

Herodotus was of opinion, that Hesiod and Homer did not live above 400 years before his time ¶.—Herodotus was born bef. Chr. 484. - - -

884

Porphry, and the generality of writers, as Suidas informs us, made Homer a hun-

\* Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 389. Tatian. § 49.

† Tatian. Clem. Alex. loc. cit.

‡ Euseb. Chron. p. 97.

|| Tatian. Clem. Alex. loc. cit.

§ Euseb. Chron. p. 106.

¶ Herod. l. ii. § 53.

dred years older than Hesiod, and supposed Hesiod to flourish only 32 years before the Olympiads *.	Bef. Chr.
- - -	908
Cornelius Nepos, in his <i>Chronica</i> , placed Homer 160 years before the building of Rome †.	
- - -	912
Solinus imagines he lived 138 years before the Olympiads ‡.	
- - -	914
Eusebius places Homer, according to the opinion of some writers, 140 years before the first Olympiad   .	
- - -	916
Velleius Paterculus says, Homer flourished 950 years before his time. He wrote his history about 30 years after the Christian æra; Homer therefore, by his reckoning, flourished bef. Chr. 920 years §.	920
Pliny, about the year 78, reckons, that Homer lived near 1000 years before him ¶.	920
Juvenal, about the year 98, likewise supposes, that Homer's poems had been extant a thousand years **.	902
Apollodorus supposed, that Homer lived 100 years after the Ionic migration, and 240 after the Trojan war ††.	944

\* Suidas in v. *Hesiodos*.

† Apud A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21.

‡ Solin. c. 40. § 17.

|| Euseb. Chron. num. 1101. p. 106.

§ Nam ferme ante annos nongentos quinquaginta floruit. Paterc. l. i. c. 5.

¶ Jam ante annos prope mille Homerus. Plin. l. vii. c. 16.

\*\* ————Uni cedit Homero,

Propter mille annos. Sat. vii. 38.

†† Clem. Alex. Tatian. loc. cit. Eusebius says, Apollodorus placed Homer 260 years after the destruction of Troy. Chron. p. 97.

Euthymenes asserted, that Homer was born in Chios, about 200 years after the taking of Troy, and that Hesiod was his contemporary *.	Bef. Chr.
- - -	984
Archemachus was of the same opinion.	984
Philochorus maintained, that Homer was born 180 years after the destruction of Troy †.	1003
- - -	
Cassius Hemina asserted, that Homer and Hesiod lived a little more than 160 years after the Trojan war ‡.	1023
- - -	
Aristarchus thought, that Homer lived at the time of the Ionic migration, which, according to Tatian and Clemens, was 140 years after the destruction of Troy §.	1044
- - -	
Eratosthenes placed τὴν ἡλικίαν, the age of Homer, 100 years after the Trojan war §.	1083
- - -	
The author of the life of Homer, ascribed to Herodotus, asserts, that Homer was born 622 years before the expedition of Xerxes into Greece, which was in 480 ¶.	1102

\* Clem. Alex. Tatian. loc. cit.

† Tatian. loc. cit. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 388. Euseb. Chron. 97.

‡ Apud A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21. Euseb. Chron. p. 101.

§ Tatian. § 49. Clem. Alex. loc. cit. Euseb. Chron. p. 97. Homeri Vita, inter Opusc. Mythol. à Galeo edita.

§ Clem. Alex. Tatian. loc. cit. Euseb. Chron. p. 100, Syncell. p. 180.—ἡλικία, in Clemens Alexandrinus, means the flourishing age, or the age of manhood.

¶ Vita Homeri, § 38.—In this passage, there is a difference of above 200 years between the computation of Homer's biographer, and that of Herodotus. This, among other circumstances, is an argument, that Herodotus was not the author of the Life of Homer. Scaliger imagines, that ἑξακοσια, 600, should be τετρακοσια, 400. Scalig. Animadv. in Euseb. num. 1548. p. 102.



Crates Mallothes supposed, that Homer flourished just before, or about, the return of the Heraclidæ, 80 years after the Trojan war*.	Bef. Chr.
- - - - -	1104
Some writers, mentioned by Eusebius, place Homer 333 years before the Olympiads †.	1109
Some, says Plutarch, affirm, that Homer lived at the time of the Trojan war, and was an eye-witness of it; others, that he lived 100 years after it ‡.	1184
- - - - -	1084
The author of the <small>PARIAN CHRONICLE</small> tells us, that Homer flourished 302 years after the Trojan war, 37 years after Hesiod, 23 before the restoration of the Olympiads by Iphitus and Lycurgus in the year 884; and 131 before their final establishment, when Coroebus was victor in the race, in 776.	907

Hesiod is supposed to have been older than Homer by Aristophanes, [Ephorus], Accius ||, &c.

Homer

\* *Προ της καθόδου.* Tatian. § 49. Euseb. Chron. num. 908. p. 97. *Homeri Vita* supra cit. *Περί την καθόδον.* Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 389.

† *Homerus secundum quorundam opinionem his fuisse temporibus judicatur.* Euseb. Chron. loc. cit.

‡ *Plut. in v. Homeri, p. 44.*—The word used by Plutarch is *γενεσθαι*, esse, to live.

|| *Aristoph. Ran. v. 1065.*—This testimony is of little weight, as it entirely depends on the order of the words, or the position of the two names, Hesiod and Homer.

*Alii minorem fuisse Homerum; in quibus L. Accius poeta, et Ephorus historiæ scriptor. Ephor. apud A. Gell. l. iii. c. 11. L. Accius, ibid.*—The argument, on which Accius founded his opinion, is extremely frivolous. Homer, he thinks, would have told

Homer and Hesiod are said to have been contemporaries by Herodotus, Ephorus, Euthymenes, Varro, Plutarch, Philostratus, Cyril,\* &c.

Homer is supposed to have lived some time before Hesiod by Philochorus, Xenophanes, Cicero, Paterculus, Josephus, Pliny, A. Gellius, Solinus, Porphyry, Eustathius, and almost all other writers †.

From

told his readers who Peleus was ; and would likewise have said, that Polyphemus had but one eye, if Hesiod had not mentioned these things before him.

\* Herod. l. ii. § 53.

Ephorus apud Syncell. p. 173.—Ephorus asserted, that Hesiod was the kinsman and contemporary of Homer. In the edition of Goarus the words are, 'Ησιδος ἐγνωρίζετο, ὃν Εἰφορος ἀνεψίον καὶ συγχρόνον ὁμοῦ φησιν ; and translated, Hesiodus florebat, quem Ephorus nepotem et sibi coævum celebrat. But this is absurd. The true reading is certainly συγχρόνον Ὁμήρου φησιν.

Euthymenes apud Clem. Alex. loc. cit.

Varro apud A. Gell. loc. cit. Varr. Fragm. p. 78.

Plutarch. de Consol. p. 105. Sympos. l. v. quæst. 2. p. 675, Sept. Sapient. Conv. p. 153.

Philostr. Ἡρώικα, in Euphorbo.

Cyril. adv. Jul. l. i. p. 11.

† Philochorus, Xenophanes.—Alii Homerum quàm Hesiodum majorem natu fuisse scripserunt, in quibus Philochorus & Xenophanes. A. Gell. l. iii. c. 11.

Cicero.—Homerus multis, ut mihi videtur, ante [Hesiodum] seculis fuit. De Senect. § 15.

Josephus.—Ὅλως δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν οὐδὲν ὁμολογούμενον εὕρισκεται γραμμά, τῆς Ὁμήρου ποιήσεως πρεσβυτερον, Neque tu scriptum omnino apud Græcos ullum, cujus de fide modò constet, Homeri poësi antiquius invenias. Cont. Ap. l. i. § 2.

Paterculus.—Hesiodus fuit circa cxx annos distinctus ab Homeri ætate. l. i. c. 7.

Pliny.—Homerus quidem primus doctrinarum et antiquitatis parens. Nat. Hist. l. xxv. c. 2.

A. Gellius.—De Homero et Hesiodo inter omnes ferè scriptores

## 226 A DISSERTATION ON

From this enquiry, concerning the age of Homer, we may deduce the following observations.

First, that there is a variation in the conjectures of the ancients, of 500 years in this article.

Secondly, that such a diversity of sentiments, respecting the age of this illustrious poet, is a farther proof of what has been already advanced, that the Greeks had no regular history or chronology before the Olympiads.

Thirdly, that the computation on the Arundelian Marble, relative to the age of Homer, does not agree with the opinion of the principal chronologers of antiquity. It differs from the computation of Apollodorus 62 years, and from that of Eratosthenes 202, in the interval between the siege of Troy and time of Homer; and from others, in a greater or less proportion; though it must be acknowledged, that we cannot form any precise idea of this diversity; since few of these writers inform us, whether they speak of the birth, the *ᾠδὴ*, or the death of Homer.

Fourthly, that the opinion, adopted by the author of the Chronicle, which supposes Hesiod to be older than Homer, is not well supported; nor is it the most commonly received opinion. Suidas informs us, that *οἱ πλείστοι*, the generality of writers, supposed Hesiod to have been 100 years younger than Homer \*. According to

*tores constitit, ætatem eos egisse vel iisdem ferè temporibus, vel Homerum aliquanto antiquiorem. Noët. Attic. l. xvii. c. 21.*

Solinus.—Inter quem [Homerum] et Hesiodem poetam, qui in auspiciis Olympiadis primæ obiit, centum triginta octo anni medii fuerunt. c. 40. § 17.

Porphyry.—Πορφύριος, καὶ ἄλλοι πλείστοι, νεώτερον ἑκάστον ἐμαυτοῖς ὄν-  
*Ζουσιν*, Porphyrius, et alii plurimi, ipsum Hóméro juniorem centum annis statuunt. Suid. in v. *Ἡσίοδος*.

Eustathius.—Apud Hom. *Odyss. l. iv. p. 187.*

\* Suidas, loc. cit.

A. Gellius, "almost all writers agreed, that Homer and Hesiod were either nearly contemporaries; or, that Homer was a little more ancient \*." It is likewise attested by Josephus, Sextus, Empiricus †, and others, that there was no writing remaining among the Greeks, more ancient than the poems of Homer. This then was the general voice of antiquity.

Lastly, that in all this controversy, so frequently and so warmly debated, both in Greece and Italy, we do not find the least reference or allusion to the Chronicle of Paros; nor any one author of antiquity, to which this Chronicle can be fairly attributed.

But let us consider the second objection.

\* De Homero & Hesiodo inter *omnes* ferè scriptores constitit, ætatem eos egisse, vel iisdem ferè temporibus, vel Homerum aliquantò antiquiorem. A. Gell. l. xvii. c. 21.

† Jos. loc. cit.—Ποιηται ουδεν προεσφουτερον ηκειν εις ημας της Ομηρου ποιησεως. Sext. Empir. adv. Mathemat. p. 41.



## C H A P. X.

**T**HE author of four Dissertations, subjoined to the book of Daniel secundum Septuaginta, printed at Rome in 1772, ascribes the Parian Chronicle to Demetrius Phalereus \*.

This writer adopts the story, related by Aristeas, concerning the translation of the Jewish scriptures into Greek; and consequently maintains, that Demetrius Phalereus was principally concerned in recommending and promoting that version. But as it is supposed to have been made in the eighth year of Ptolemy Philadelphus †, 277 years before the Christian æra, after the death

\* ΔΑΝΙΗΛ κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομηκοντα, ἐκ τῶν Τετραπλῶν Ὠριγενούς. Daniel secundum LXX. ex Tetraplis Originis, nunc primùm editus è singulari Chisiano codice, annorum supra 15000. Romæ 1772. folio.

† “ Within the compass of this year archbishop Usher places the making of this translation. And here all must place it, who with him BELIEVE the history to be GENUINE, which is written of it under the name of Aristeas, and will hold what is consistent with it herein. For, according to that author, they cannot place it later; because then it would not fall within the time of Eleazar, who is therein said to have been the high-priest of the Jews, that sent the seventy-two elders to Alexandria to make this translation; for he died about the beginning of the next year. And they cannot place it sooner; because then it would be before Ptolemy Philadelphus married Arsinoë, his sister, whom Eleazar, in the epistle, which the author makes him to have written to this prince, calls his queen and his sister.” Prid. Connect. vol. iii. p. 38. Vid. Aristæ Hist. edit. Oxon. p. 17.

The learned Dr. Hody is of opinion, that the Pentateuch only was translated into Greek, about the year 285, when Ptolemy Philadelphus

death of Demetrius, our author endeavours to remove this chronological objection, by proving, that Demetrius was not only alive at that time, but that he afterwards composed a history of the Jews, and the Parian Chronicle \*.

I shall briefly consider his arguments and observations relative to the Chronicle.

“ This performance,” he observes, “ is evidently the work of one person †.”

Granted.

“ The author has paid more attention to poets, and the history of literature, than to warriors or military transactions ; of which we have instances in the fiftieth and sixty-fifth epochas, where he speaks of Simonides and Sophocles ‡.”

Admitting the truth of this remark, it will only prove, that the writer was a poet, or a man of letters ; which no person will controvert.

“ It is well known,” says the learned editor of Daniel, “ that Demetrius Phalereus was the author of a work, entitled, *των Αρχοντων Αναγραφη*, which was esteemed by the ancients, and is cited by Diogenes Laertius, in order to ascertain the date of some events in the lives of

Iadelphus was king of Egypt, in partnership with his father ; and that this version was not made by royal authority, but by the Jews of Alexandria, for the use of the synagogue. De Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i.

\* Dr. Chandler seems to have acquiesced in this opinion ; for he says : “ This Demetrius was author of the ancient and famous Chronicon, inscribed on marble at Paros, and now preserved, but not entire, at Oxford. See Daniel à LXX. p. 480. Rome, 1772.” Chandler’s Travels in Greece, c. vii.

† Auctor certè unus fuit. Dissert. iv. § 21.

‡ Poetarum potius mentionem ingerit, indeque literarum historiam profequitur. Ibid.

Thales and Anaxagoras. From which it appears, that his performance was not a mere list of names ; but included many historical events, such as we find in the Parian Chronicle \*."

From this very slight and equivocal resemblance between the plan of the *Αναγραφή*, and that of the Chronicle, we can by no means infer, that they were the productions of the same writer.

For, 1. the Chronicle takes no notice of Thales or Anaxagoras, or of the circumstances, for which the *Αναγραφή* is quoted by Laertius. Yet we might have expected to find a perfect coincidence in these articles, if the one had been a copy of the other.

2. Demetrius, as Plutarch informs us, asserted, that Aristides was archon after the battle at Plataeæ, a little before his death †, which happened in the year 467. But nothing of this kind is to be found in the Chronicle.

3. From Creon to Diotimus inclusive, there were 330 annual archons ; but allowing one for each epocha, not more than forty-seven were originally mentioned in the Chronicle, within that period. The Chronicle therefore cannot, in any sense of the word, be styled, *τῶν Ἀρχόντων Ἀναγραφή*, a catalogue of the archons.

There is a dispute among the ancients concerning the age of Socrates. Some say, that he lived sixty, others seventy years. The Parian Chronicle asserts, that he died at the age of seventy, when Laches was archon at Athens.

This, our author observes, is likewise asserted by Demetrius Phalereus. For, says Diogenes Laertius,

\* In Marmore Arundelliano nihil occurrit, quod non conveniat Demetrio. Ibid. p. 481.

† Plut. in v. Arist. p. 321.



“Socrates died in the first year of the ninety-fifth Olympiad, when he was seventy years of age. Demetrius Phalereus says the same \*. Others tell us, that he died at the age of sixty.”

I answer: fifty writers might say this, as well as Demetrius Phalereus; for Plato, fourscore years before, had made Socrates tell the Athenians, in his Apology, that he was above seventy years of age, when he was brought to his trial †.

2. It does not appear, that Laertius took this account of the age of Socrates from the *Αναγραφή* of Demetrius. He most probably found it in another work by the same author, entitled, *SOCRATES*, which is mentioned in the list of his writings, and quoted by Plutarch in his Life of Aristides ‡.

3. This coincidence does not, by any means, prove, that the Chronicle was composed by Demetrius; because a modern author would naturally take his account of the age of Socrates, either from Plato or Laertius.

Laertius, in his catalogue of the writings of Demetrius, takes no notice of his *Αναγραφή*, or however does not mention it under this title.

The author of the Dissertation imagines, that “his account of the archons might be included in his two books *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων πολιτῶν*, Of the Citizens of Athens,

\* *Καὶ ταῦτα φησὶ καὶ Δημητρίος ὁ Φαλέρειος*, eadem fermè Demetrius Phalereus. Diog. Laert. in v. Demet. l. v. § 44.

† *Ἐτη γεγονώς πλείω ἑβδομηκοντα*, plures quàm septuaginta annos natus. Apol. Socrat. § 1. Diod. Sic. l. xiv. p. 266.

Socrates was born in the year bef. Chr. 469, and died in 400. Corlin. Fasti Attici. tom. iii. p. 189. 281.

‡ Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius mention a book, written by Demetrius Phalereus, entitled, *SOCRATES*. Plut. in v. Aristid. § 1. Diog. Laert. l. v. § 81. Diogenes likewise quotes a work by Demetrius, which is probably the same performance, entitled, *Socratis Apologia*, l. ix. § 15. § 37. Vid. Athen. l. xiii. § 1.



which is mentioned by Laertius ; and this," he thinks, "will be very probable, if, instead of *πολιτων*, citizens, we read *πολιτευσαντων*, governors or magistrates."

As this correction of the text is unsupported by any authority, it is of no weight in the argument. The omission of the *Αναγραφη*, in the Catalogue given by Laertius, would lead us to suspect, that it was a performance of no great consequence.

If it had been either the Chronicle itself, or the original, from which the Chronicle was taken, it would have been accounted a work of importance to the general history of Greece, and have been much oftener quoted than it is. At present, we have only two or three general references in Laertius to certain passages in it, which do NOT EXIST in the Chronicle.

At the beginning of the Chronicle, we find the following remaining characters, which no commentator has attempted to explain.

. . . . . ου . . . . . ντων . . . . . ων . . . . .  
 . . . . . νων ανεγραψα τους, κ. τ. λ.

Our author fills up these lacunæ in this manner.

Δημητριος ὁ Φανοστρατοῦ Φαληρεὺς, ἐκ τῶν συμμαχικῶν ὑπαρχόντων, ανεγραψα τους, κ. τ. λ. Demetrius Phanostрати filius Phalereus, ex omnibus quæ extant monumentis edidi, &c.

This is an ingenious supplement ; but it does not coincide with ALL the remaining letters ; and any other names will suit the place, as well as those of Demetrius Phalereus and Phanosttratus, provided the name of the father, in the genitive case, ends in ΟΥ.

Our author observes, that Demetrius, in his computation of time, uses an expression, which is constantly employed in the Parian Chronicle : namely, *αφ' ου*, ex quo.

Αφ'

Αφ' ου δε αι φυλαι αι δεκα, ex quo autem decem tribus.  
 Αφ' ου δε εξ 'Ιεροσολυμων, ex quo autem ex Hierosolymis \*.  
 Αφ' ου δε εκλεγηναι Αβρααμ, ex quo selectus est Abraamus.  
 Αφ' ου δε εκ Χανααν αυτον ελθειν εις Αιγυπτον, ex quo venit è  
 terrâ Chananæâ in Ægyptum †."

In answer to this argument we may remark, that αφ' ου is a common phrase; and that no inference can be drawn from it. For instance :

Αφ' ου ο κυριος εγεννηθη, ex quo natus est Dominus.  
 Αφ' ου δε επαθεν, ex quo autem passus est. Αφ' ου εση το  
 βδελυγμα υπο Νερωνος, ex quo stetit abominatio à Ne-  
 rone ‡.

Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius have indeed quoted a writer called Demetrius, in which the foregoing passages occur. But he must have an uncommon share of credulity, who can believe, that the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus wrote a history of the Jews ! The first passage above cited, if taken from Demetrius, seems to contain a refutation of this opinion ; for the time is there computed from the captivity of the ten tribes, to the FOURTH Ptolemy ||, or Ptolemy Philopator, who did not begin his reign till the year before Christ 222, a long time after the death of Demetrius Phalereus §.

It

\* Demetrius apud Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 403.

† Id. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. ix. c. 21. p. 425.

‡ Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 407, 408. Vid. African. apud Euseb. Chron. p. 47.

|| Αφ' ου δε αι φυλαι αι δεκα εκ Σαμαρειας αιχμαλωτοι γεγονασιν, έως Πτολεμαιοι τεταρτου, ετη πεντακοσια εβδομηκοντα τρια, μηνες εντεα. Ex quo autem decem tribus abductæ fuerunt captivæ ex Samariâ, usque ad Ptolemæum quartum, anni DLXXIII, novem menses. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 403.

§ In order to remove this objection, the author translates έως Πτολεμαιοι τεταρτου, ετη πεντακοσια εβδομηκοντα τρια, not as the words are

It has been observed, that Josephus \* speaks of Demetrius Phalereus, as a writer of the Jewish history.

Huetius thinks, that Josephus, in this case, has confounded Demetrius Phalereus, with Demetrius Judæus, who wrote an account of the Jewish kings †.

Jonsius supposes, that in the passage, where Demetrius is mentioned by Josephus, the word *Phalereus* has been inserted by some officious interpreter ; or that there was a younger writer called Demetrius Phalereus ‡.

But

are usually rendered, usque ad Ptolemæum quartum ; but, usque ad Ptolemæi quartum annum, anni DLXXIII.

If, says he, Demetrius had meant the *fourth* Ptolemy, he would have expressed himself thus : ἐως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ τεταρτου.—But this is by no means a consequence. On similar occasions, the numeral adjective is used by various authors, without the prepositive article. Thus Joannes Malala : ἐβασιλευσε τρίτος Πτολεμαίος—ἐβασιλευσε τεταρτος Πτολεμαίος—δωδεκατος δὲ Πτολεμαίος, &c. Malalæ Chronog. l. viii. p. 250.—Και γὰρ τρίτος Πτολεμαίος. Jos. cont. Ap. l. ii. § 5.

\* Cont. Ap. l. i. § 23. See also Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 21. p. 404.

† Huet. Demonstr. Evang. prop. iv. c. 2. § 20.

‡ Demetrium quendam de Judæorum regibus scripsisse credo Clementi. Phalereum ejus libri auctorem esse Josepho non credo ; sed glossematis loco habendam esse vocem *Phalereus* adserere malim ; vel junior fuerit Demetrius Phalereus, et à priori diversus. Jonsius, de Script. Hist. Phil. l. i. c. 18. § 4.

Jerom speaks of this Demetrius as a Jew. Clemens Alexandrinus, he says, DE JUDÆIS Aristobulum quendam, et Demetrium, et Eupoleum, scriptores ADVERSUS GENTES refert, qui in similitudinem Josephi Ἀρχαιογονίας Moysis & Judaicæ gentis asseverant. De Script. Eccl. tom. i. p. 281.

This Demetrius, says Prideaux, was an historian, that wrote in Greek, and an inhabitant of Alexandria, where he compiled a history of the Jews, and continued it down to the reign of the fourth Ptolemy, who was Ptolemy Philopator, the grandson of Philadelphus.



But I can scarce think, that *Phalereus* is an interpolation; because Tertullian and Eusebius, who have quoted Josephus, call the Jewish historian Demetrius Phalereus \*.

I rather believe, there was some counterfeit history of the Jews, in circulation, under the name of this eminent philosopher.

Fabricius is of this opinion: Demetrium intelligo Judæum quendam, qui scripserat librum de Regibus Judæorum, sub nomine fortassis Demetrii Phalerei †.

It is allowed on all hands, that Demetrius Phalereus, some time after he was driven out of Athens by the prevailing power of Demetrius Poliorcetes, retired into Egypt, and was honourably received by Ptolemy Soter. This is mentioned by Cicero, Diodorus Siculus, Ælian, Diogenes Laertius, Plutarch, Suidas, and other ancient writers ‡.

But none of these writers give us the least intimation

phus. His having written so agreeably to the scripture, seems to prove him to have been a Jew. Connect. vol. iii. p. 66.

Fabricius enumerates above a hundred Demetrii. Bibl. Græc. vol. x. p. 390.

\* Tertull. Apoll. § 19. Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. ix. c. 42.

† Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vol. iii. p. 117.

‡ Phalereus Demetrius cum patriâ pulsus esset injuriâ, ad Ptolemæum se regem Alexandriam contulit. Cic. de Fin. l. v. c. 19.

Ἐφυγεν πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ad Ptolemæum in Ægyptum per fugit. Diod. Sic. l. xx. p. 782.

Ἐν Αἰγυπτῷ δὲ, συνὼν τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ, νομοθεσίας ἤξε. In Ægypto apud Ptolemæum scribendis legibus præfuit. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. iii. c. 17.

Diog. Laert. l. v. § 78.

Ἡρώτης τῶν Πτολεμαίου φίλων, amicorum Ptolemæi omnium primus. Plut. de Exil. p. 601.

Ἦατα τῷ Σατιρῇ Πτολεμαίῳ διατρίβων, apud Ptolemæum Soterem degens. Suidas.

Strab. l. ix. p. 610.



of his continuing in favour with Ptolemy Philadelphus. On the contrary, Diogenes Laertius, on the authority of Hermippus, informs us, that Demetrius had given great offence to Philadelphus, by endeavouring to persuade Ptolemy Soter to leave his dominions to Ceraunus \*, his elder son, by a former marriage ; that Philadelphus, after the death of his father, ordered him to be taken into custody, and confined, till he had determined, in what manner he should treat him ; and that, in the mean time, he was killed by the bite of an asp †. This was probably soon after he was apprehended, as his confinement was only a temporary expedient ‡.

Hermippus adds, that “ Demetrius was buried near Diospolis,” a city of Egypt, in the Delta, not far from

\* Ceraunus was Ptolemy’s eldest son, by Eurydice the daughter of Antipater. Appian. de Bell. Syr. p. 128. al. 207. Ptolemy Philadelphus was a younger son, by his second wife, Berenice.

† Καὶ πῶς ὑπνωττων, ὑπ’ ἀσπίδος τὴν χεῖρα δηχθεὶς, τὸν βίον μετέβηκε. Ac fortè dormitans, ab aspidè manum morsus, ex vitâ migravit. Diog. Laert. l. v. § 78. edit. Meibomii. Cicero seems to intimate, that the death of Demetrius was not accidental : Aspidè ad corpus *admotâ*, vitâ esse privatum. Orat. pro Rab. Posth.

The excellent Corfini supposes, that his death was voluntary : animi ægitudine percussus, aspidis morsu sibi mortem conscivit. Fast. Attic. tom. iv. p. 80.

Simson, in his Chronicon, explains the words of Diogenes Laertius above-cited in a manner, something different from the generality of commentators ; and his learned editor Wesselingius acquiesces in his interpretation : Aspidis morsum, sine dolore letiferum esse aiunt. Itaque Ælianus de Animal. l. ix. c. 11. scripsit, τὸν [θανάτον] ἐκ τοῦ θήματος τῆς ἀσπίδος, πρῶτον εἶναι καὶ ἀβληχρὸν, “ lenem & imbecillem mortem esse, quæ aspidis morsu afferretur.” Talis igitur Demetrii mors innuitur fuisse, qui dormitanti similis (ὑπνωττων πῶς) vitâ excessisse dicitur. Simsonii Chron. sub an. 3721. edit. Wesseling. 1729.

‡ Petavius, Corfini, &c. place the death of Demetrius in the first year of the cxxiv Olympiad, bef. Chr. 284. Ration. Temp. l. iii. c. 18. Corfin. loc. cit.

the Mendefian channel of the Nile. From which, I think, we may infer, that he had been banished from the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

The testimony of Hermippus is of great weight in this instance, as he was an accurate historian, and lived about the time of Ptolemy Philopator \* ; and therefore could scarcely be at a loss for authentic information, relative to one of the most illustrious men of his age.

It must be acknowledged, that Aristeas, Aristobulus, Philo, Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Cyril of Jerufalem, Epiphanius, and others †, have asserted, that Demetrius was greatly respected by Ptolemy Philadelphus, and principally concerned in obtaining the translation of the Bible, commonly called the Septuagint.

\* Hermippus was of Smyrna. Athenæus calls him καλλιμαχῆος, from which it is supposed he was one of the disciples of Callimachus. Deipnos. l. ii. p. 58. l. v. p. 213. He wrote many books, and particularly the lives of eminent men, which are frequently cited by Diogenes Laertius, under the title of βίαι. D. Laert. l. i. § 33. l. ii. § 13. l. v. § 2. He flourished about the year bef. Chr. 220. Vid. Voss. de Hist. Græc. l. i. c. 16. Jons. de Scrip. Hist. Phil. l. ii. c. 9. § 4. Dodwell. de Cyclis, disert. iii. § 12.

Dionysius Halicarnassæus, Josephus, and other ancient writers, speak of him with applause.

Ἑρμιππος ἀρετῆς ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοῖς γενομένος. Dionys. Halic. de Isæo, p. 104.

Ἄνθρωπος περὶ πᾶσαν ἱστορίαν ἐπιμελής, vir circa omnem historiam diligens indagator. Jos. cont. Apion. l. i. § 22.

† Aristeæ Historia lxxii Interpretum. Oxon. 1692. Aristob. apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. xiii. c. 12.—Aristobulus is supposed to have lived about 123 years before Christ. Prid. Connect. vol. ii. p. 41. Philo de Vitâ Mosis, l. ii. Jos. Antiq. l. xii. c. 2. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. § 22. p. 410. Tertul. Apol. § 18. Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. iv. c. 34. Epiph. de Mens. & Pond. c. 9.

The book, which is transmitted down to us under the name of Aristeas, is apparently the foundation of all that has been said, concerning the manner of making this version by seventy-two elders, sent from Jerusalem to Alexandria for that purpose. The ecclesiastical writers adopted his narration with implicit credulity (as it seemed to do honour to the Scriptures) and embellished it with the story of the seventy-two cells \*, the wonderful agreement of the interpreters, their prophetic inspiration †, and other circumstances, equally absurd and incredible ‡. But the most judicious writers reject it as a fiction, contrived by some Hellenistic Jew, in order to give a sanction to the Greek translation of the scriptures, and advance the glory of his own nation ||.

“Demetrius Phalereus,” as Plutarch relates, “advised king Ptolemy to collect and read such books, as treated of the government of states and kingdoms ; for,” says he, “they contain that salutary counsel, which friends never venture to give their sovereigns §.”

The author of the Dissertation contends, that these words cannot be referred to Ptolemy Soter, an aged and learned prince ; that it is evident they were addressed to

\* Just. Mart. Cohort. ad Græc. p. 13. Epiaph. de Mens. & Pond. c. 3.

† Philo. loc. cit.

‡ Nescio quis primus auctor, septuaginta cellulas Alexandrie mendacio suo extruxerit, quibus divini eadem scriptitarint. Hieron. in Pentat. præf. tom. iii. p. 14.

Quæ pridem à Ludovico Vive, Josepho Scaligero, aliisque magnis nominibus explosa ; à Pseudo-Aristeâ, Judæo-Hellenistâ, ad conciliandam versionis istius auctoritatem coniuncta ; à veteribus credulâ nimis, ut solent, mente suscepta, avidius autem à Latinis et recentioribus defensa. Spanhemii Introd. ad Hist. p. 157.

|| Vid. Hodi de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i.

§ Plut. in Apophthegm. Regum, p. 189.



Philadelphus, who considered Demetrius, not only as his preceptor, but as his parent.

In answer to this objection I must observe, that if Demetrius went into Egypt in the year before Christ 308 \*, as Eusebius says he did, he might very properly give Ptolemy Soter this advice; for Ptolemy did not assume the title of king, till the year 305 †, and most probably had not then begun to form his library.

If, as I rather think, he retired into Egypt on the death of Cassander ‡, in 298, he was there in the seventh year of Ptolemy Soter; and as he lived with that prince above 13 years, in the character of his legislator, his counsellor, and his friend, he might give this advice without any kind of impropriety, either to the father or the son, and yet afterwards incur the displeasure of the latter, as Hermippus relates.

Our author, in conformity to his hypothesis, which makes Demetrius Phalereus the writer of the Parian Chronicle, maintains, that this learned Athenian was living in the cxxix Olympiad, when the Chronicle is supposed to have been compiled.

Let us consider the probability of this opinion in a chronological view. Demetrius was appointed governor of Athens in the year 318, and, for the space of ten years, discharged that important office with so much

\* Fuga Demetrii in Ægyptum incidit in Olymp. cxviii. 2. i. e. bef. Chr. 307. Bruckeri Hist. Crit. Phil. vol. i. p. 857. Petavius and Corfinius place it in the same year. Rat. Temp. l. iii. c. 18. Fasti Attici, vol. iv. p. 67.

† In this reign Ptolemy the astronomer places the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Soter.

‡ Μετα την Κασσαίου τελευτην, αναγκασθη φυγειν εις Αιγυπτον, Cassandrio mortuo, fugere in Ægyptum fuerit coactus. Strab. l. ix. p. 610. In this article, Strabo corroborates the testimony of Hermippus.



probity and wisdom \*, that three hundred and sixty statues were erected to his honour †. Athens was at that time in a situation, which required the most consummate policy and prudence in a governor. We may therefore presume, that his abilities were well known, and that he was 35 or 40 years of age, when he was elected ‡. If he was, it is highly improbable he should compose the Chronicle fifty-four years afterwards.

Plutarch dates the authority of Demetrius in the government of Athens, from the time of the Lamian war ||, between the Athenians and Antipater, in the second year of the cxiv Olympiad, bef. Chr. 323 years. This makes an interval of fifty-nine years, between his appearing at Athens in a public character, and the date of the Parian inscription.

This argument may be still farther confirmed by the testimony of Athenæus. “Ctesicles,” says that writer, “in the third book of his Chronica, asserts, that in the cx Olympiad, Demetrius Phalereus enumerated the inhabitants of Attica, and found that there were 21,000 Athenians, 10,000 sojourners or foreigners, and 400,000 slaves §.” This was 337 years before the Christian

\* Fuit enim hic vir non solum eruditissimus, sed etiam civis è republicâ maximè, tuendæque civitatis peritissimus. Cic. de Leg. l. ii. sub fin. Αθηνησιν επιφανεστατα επολιτευσατο, Athenis summâ cum gloriâ rempublicam rexit. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. iii. c. 17.

† Diog. Laert. l. v. § 75.

‡ Ἠεθθη, electus est. Diod. Sic. l. xviii. p. 647. Olymp. cxv. 3. bef. Chr. 318.

|| Plut. in v. Demet. p. 893. Diod. Sic. l. xviii. p. 596.

§ Κτησικλης δε εν τριτη Χρονικων, τη δεκατη, προς ταις εκατον φησιν Ολυμπιαδι, κ, τ. λ. Athen. l. vi. p. 272. There is probably an error in the text of Athenæus; but, till we have authority to correct it, we must take it as it stands. Demetrius might be in some public station, and make this computation several years before he was appointed governor by Cassander.

æra, and 73 years before the date of the Chronicle. According to this account, it is utterly incredible, that Demetrius should be any ways concerned in that performance,

The presumptive evidence against our author's opinion, which arises from the SILENCE of all the writers of antiquity, with respect to the Parian Chronicle, is, in this instance, remarkably strong, if not decisive. Demetrius Phalereus was not a writer of an inferior class, or an obscure rhetorician; but an author of the highest distinction, whose name and character would have given so much authority to the inscription, that it must have excited the attention of succeeding historians, biographers, or chronologists. But as not one of them has either cited or mentioned it, we can never suppose, that it was the production of this illustrious philosopher and legislator.

“Cùm nusquam occurrit mentio libri,” says Le Clerc, “nomine philosophi insigniti, falsa sit inscriptio, aut minimùm suspecta fiat necesse est; quia credibile non est, librum, insignis præsertim philosophi, potuisse non modò fugere diligentiam Diogenis Laertii, sed tiam ita sperni, ut nusquam citaretur ab iis, qui frequenter de eo philosopho verba fecerunt, nec rarò aliorum ejus operum meminerunt \*,”

\* Clerici Art. Crit. p. iii. sect. 2. c. 3. vol. ii. p. 337.

CHAP. XI.

**T**HIRDLY, it may be objected, that the works of some eminent writers of antiquity, such as Phædrus, Q. Curtius, &c. lay in obscurity for many centuries, and were not discovered till later ages.

To obviate this objection, it will be necessary to consider the peculiar circumstances of these authors.

1. Phædrus is said to have been the freedman of Augustus, or Tiberius. Saxius places him in the reign of Claudius, 48 years after the Christian æra \*. His fables were first published by Pet. Pithœus, in 1596.

Martial certainly means this fabulist, when he asks, if Canius Rufus, a poet of Gades,

Æmulatur improbi jocos Phædri †.

IMPROBUS plainly alludes to the satire, which Phædrus conceals under the actions or the dialogues of birds and beasts. Accordingly, Rigaltius, Gudius, and others, suppose, that the HYDRUS, in the second fable, represents Caligula.

The word *jocos* evidently points out the fabulist. Æsop's fables are called by Aristophanes, Hesychius, and others, γελοια, joci ‡.

The same expression is used by Avienus, when he says, the fables of Æsop, “sub jocorum communium

\* Sax. Onomast. vol. i. p. 241.

† Mart. l. iii. ep. 20. Vid. l. i. 62. iii. 64.—Martial wrote about the year 94.

‡ ——— Δισσώπου τι γελοιον. Aristoph. Vesp. v. 564.—Δισσώπου γελοιον. Ibid. v. 1251.—Δισσώπου γελοια. Hesych. Dion. Chrys. Orat. 82. p. 631.

specie, vitæ argumenta contineant ;” and by Phædrus himself, when he speaks of his own productions :

*Fictis jocari nos meminerit fabulis.—*

*Calumniâmq; fictis elusit jocis \*.*

We do not find, that Phædrus is mentioned by any other writer, till we come to Avienus, who is supposed to have lived about the year 410. This fabulist, in his dedication to Theodosius [Macrobius] expressly mentions the five books of Phædrus : “ Phædrus etiam partem aliquam quinque in libellos resolvit.”

But Seneca, it is observed, has given some intimation, that there were no fables in the Roman language in his time ; for he thus writes to Polybius : “ Non audeo te usque eo producere, ut fabellas quoque, et Æsopæos logos †, intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus, solitâ tibi venustate connectas ‡.”

In order to account for this observation, some have imagined, that Phædrus’s work was in few hands, and unknown to Seneca ; or that he did not think of it, when he was writing to Polybius ||. Pithœus, Lipsius, and Vossius, suppose, that Phædrus is not mentioned in this passage, because he was not a Roman, but a Thracian. Vavassor conceives, that his fables were suppressed, or not noticed, because the satirical allusions

\* Phæd. Prol. v. 7. Id. ad Eutychem, l. iii. 37. l. iv. 6. 2.

† Æsopæi logi, i. e. apologi, fabulæ.

Æsop is called by Diogenes Laertius, ὁ λογοποιός, fabularum scriptor. Lib. i. § 72. Λογῶν Αἰσώπειων συλλογαί, fabularum Æsopiarum collectiones, are mentioned by the same author, among the works of Demetrius Phalereus. In the edition of Meibomius, 1692, the word λογῶν is improperly translated *orationum*, instead of *fabularum*. Lib. v. § 80.

‡ Sen. Consol. ad Polyb. c. 27.

|| Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. ii. c. 3. vol. i. p. 373.



they contain were obnoxious to the tyrants of those days \*.

Fabricius, from the words *connectas* and *resolverit*, c. 30. infers, that Seneca could not properly mention Phædrus, as he was not then speaking of Æsopic fables in verse, but of similar compositions in prose †.

Upon these grounds learned writers have contended, that the fables of Phædrus might have been extant in the time of Seneca, notwithstanding the preceding remark.

It is acknowledged, that they are not mentioned by any writer, except Martial, before Avienus, in the fifth century.

In this case, we can only suppose, that the general silence of the ancients might have been owing to several causes, or concurring circumstances; such as, the character of Phædrus, as a freedman, a minor poet, a copyer of Æsop, and the author of compositions, which no historian could have any occasion to cite; or probably to some contingencies, which I shall consider in the next article.

II. It is alleged, that the history of Alexander the Great, by Q. Curtius, is neither quoted, nor mentioned by any of the ancients.

Who Q. Curtius was, and when he lived, are points, which cannot be determined with any certainty. Tacitus and the younger Pliny speak of one Curtius Rufus, who was proconsul of Africa, in the reign of Ti-

\* Vavassor de Ludierâ Dictione. p. 208. edit. 1658. Morhof. de Patav. Livianâ. c. 12. p. 158.

† Fabric. Bibl. Lat. loc. cit. Id. Bibl. Græc. l. ii. c. 9. § 12. But see the use of the word *resolverit*, in the passage above cited from Avienus.

berius \*, about the year 37. And as Tacitus observes, that he lived to “a very advanced age †,” Vossius imagines he might be alive, and write, or finish, his history in the reign of Vespasian : that is, in or after the year 69 ; for there are many passages in it, which, he thinks, evidently allude to that period ‡.

One Q. Curtius Rufus is mentioned by Suetonius, in his catalogue of the celebrated rhetoricians ; and he is supposed by Casaubon, Vossius, Perizonius, Fabricius, and others, to have been the author of the history in question.

Pliny, in an epistle to Saturninus, applauds one of his friends, whose name was Rufus, and says, *Legi librum omnibus numeris absolutum*, “I have read his book, which is highly finished ||.” But there is no circumstance in this epistle, which can lead us to infer, with any certainty, that Pliny alludes to the History of Alexander.

It has been observed, that Quintilian, who wrote about the year 88, and mentions the most considerable historians §, takes no notice of Q. Curtius ; and from this, and other circumstances, some have inferred, that the History of Alexander, which is now extant under the name of Q. Curtius, is a modern composition. But this inference is arbitrary and illogical. Quintilian does not attempt to mention all the eminent historians THEN extant. He takes not the least notice of A. Hir- tius, Cornelius Nepos, Trogus Pompeius, and many others.

\* Tacit. Annal. l. xi. c. 20, 21. Plin. Epist. l. vii. c. 27.

† Longâ post hæc senectâ. Tacit. loc. citat.

‡ Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. iv. c. 28. p. 146. Saxii Onomasticon, p. 258.

|| Plin. l. ix. 38.

§ Quint. l. x. c. 1.

Montfaucon asserts, that there was a manuscript copy of Q. Curtius in M. Colbert's library at Paris, above 800 years old \*. Fabricius observes, that this historian is quoted by Petrus Blæsenfis, who wrote about the year 1150; by Johannes Sarisburiensis about the year 1170; and by Vincentius Bellovacensis in the year 1244 †.

Antonius Panormita tells us, that Alphonsus, king of Arragon, who began his reign in 1252, was cured of an obstinate indisposition by the delight he took in reading the history of Alexander, and used to rally his medical attendants by declaring, that Curtius was a much better physician than Avicenna ‡.

These testimonies, taken from writers of the twelfth and 13th centuries, are proofs, that the History of Alexander, ascribed to Q. Curtius, is not a modern composition.

Admitting then, that this history was written in the first century, and that it lay in obscurity for above a thousand years, we may account for the silence of the ancients on the following suppositions.

Let us only conceive, that the first part || of this work was destroyed by some accident in the author's life-time, or after his death, before a second copy of it was taken, such a disaster might prevent its publication at first, and afterwards impede its general circulation.

\* Montf. Palæog. Græc. præf. p. ii.

† Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. ii. c. 17. § 1.

‡ Frequenter in medicos rex jocatus, Avicennam, velut parabolanum, parvi facere, Curtium laudibus cumulare. Ant. Panormita de Dictis & Factis Alphonsi regis Aragonum, l. i. p. 14, 15. edit. 1538.

|| The two first books are entirely lost; and there are four other deficiencies; namely, book v. ch. 13. b. vi. ch. 1. b. x. ch. 1. and 4, which Freinshemius and others have endeavoured to supply. — The first edition of Q. Curtius was printed in 1474.



The manuscript, it is possible, might fall, as Aristotle's books did, into the hands of *ανθρωποι ιδιωται*, illiterate men\*, or some *βιβλιοταφος*, some CURIOUS COLLECTOR

\* Aristotle left his books to Theophrastus, who was his successor in the Lyceum. Theophrastus "bequeathed them to Neleus." [Diog. Laert. in v. Theoph. l. v. § 52.] who carried them to Scepsis. The heirs of Neleus were *ιδιωται ανθρωποι*, men of no learning, and kept them locked up. When they heard, that the king of Pergamus was collecting books for his library, they hid them in a hole under ground, where they were much damaged by the damp and worms. A long time afterwards they were sold to Apellico, a rich citizen of Athens, who was a lover of books, but no philosopher. Apellico caused them to be transcribed, and the deficiencies supplied; but this was done without either accuracy or judgement. After his death, 86 years before the Christian æra, Sylla took the city of Athens, and removed this library to Rome, where Tyrannio the grammarian had the use of Aristotle's works. Andronicus Rhodius received a copy of them from Tyrannio; and having corrected, and ranged them in order, presented them to the public. Strab. l. xiii. p. 906. Plut. in v. Syllæ, p. 468.

Athenæus reports, that all Aristotle's books, *τα τωτων βιβλια παντα* [legendum fortè *τωτων*] were bought of Neleus by Ptolemy Philadelphus. Deipnos. l. i. p. 3. Yet, in another place, he says, his library was bought by Apellico, l. v. p. 214. These seeming contradictions may perhaps be reconciled by supposing, that Ptolemy bought only copies of his writings.

Neleus was the disciple of Aristotle and Theophrastus. Aristotle died bef. Chr. 322 years; Theophrastus about 286; and Ptolemy Philadelphus came to the crown about two years afterwards. If this prince had any negociation with Neleus, it must have been in the former part of his reign. However, it is very probable, that either Athenæus, or some of his editors, have made a mistake in the passage, where Philadelphus is said to have bought all Aristotle's books of Neleus.

The disasters abovementioned have occasioned innumerable omissions, disarrangements, perplexities, and difficulties, in almost all the productions of Aristotle, and opened a wide field for the combats of his followers and commentators, which, in about three centuries after Albertus Magnus, that is, between the year 1260 and



LECTOR of books, who might keep it in durance for half a century, and then bequeath it to a successor like himself. These contingencies will account for the silence of Quintilian and his contemporaries.

There are various other reasons, why a manuscript may be with-held from public view, or confined to a few private hands; and these reasons have so far operated, that many valuable writings have been suffered to moulder in oblivion for several ages.

Diogenes Laertius informs us, that the works of Thucydides, which the author left unfinished, lay in obscurity, till they were brought to light by Xenophon\*.

But the case of the Parian Chronicle is widely different. It was neither left unfinished, nor was it written on paper, or parchment, and, in that condition, liable to be concealed in a bookcase or a chest; but it was OSTENTATIVELY ENGRAVED ON MARBLE.

We may therefore still assert, that, in this case, the silence of the ancients is unaccountable.

Before I conclude this chapter, I must observe, that a circumstance, on which the preceding objection entirely depends, is rather taken for granted than proved, which is, the authenticity of the works, ascribed to Phædrus and Q. Curtius†. If they are the productions of later ages, which indeed I do not suppose, the objection is at once superseded.

1560, amounted to 12,000 authors. *Patricii Discuss. Peripat.* l. x. p. 145.

\* *Diog. Laert.* in v. *Xenoph.* l. ii. § 57.

† A collection of epistles, in five books, was published in 1500, under the name of one Q. Curtius; but they are stupid forgeries. *Fabricius* has condescended to reprint them, in his *Bibliotheca Latina*, vol. i. p. 644. edit. 1728.

## C H A P. XII.

VI. **S**OME of the facts, mentioned in the Chronicle, seem to have been taken from writers of a later date.

In the following passages there is an APPEARANCE of imitation; or a stronger resemblance, than such as may be supposed to arise from accident.

## PASSAGES in the PARIAN CHRONICLE.

Ερως. 1. Αφ ου Κεκροψ Αθηνων εβασιλευσε, και η χωρα Κεκροπια εκληθη, το προτερον καλουμενη Αττικη απο Αιταιου του αυτοχθονος. A quo Cecrops Athenis regnavit, et regio Cecropia dicta est, quæ prius dicebatur Actica ab Actæo indigenâ.

Ερως. 2. Αφ ου Δευκαλιων παρα τον Παρνασσον εν Λυκωρεια εβασιλευσε. A quo Deucalion apud Parnassum in Lycoriâ regnavit.

## PARALLEL PASSAGES in GREEK AUTHORS.

Κεκροψ της Αττικης εβασιλευσε πρωτος, και την γην, προτερον λεγομενην Αιτην, αφ' εαυτου Κεκροπιαν ωνομασεν. Cecrops in terrâ Atticâ primus regnavit, et quæ prius Acta dicebatur, de suo ipsius vocabulo Cecropian dici voluit. Apollod. l. iii. c. 13. § 1. edit. Gal. 1675. c. 14. edit. Heyn. 1782.

Απ' αυτου δε Κεκροπια η χωρα εκληθη. Syncell. p. 153. Euseb. Chron. p. 28.

Δευκαλιων βασιλευεν των μετα Παρνασσον ηξιστα. Deucalion iis qui ad Parnassum imperitare cœpit. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 28. 109.

Ερως.

Ερος. 3. Αφ ου δίκη Αθη-  
νησι[ν εγε]νετο Αρει και Ποσει-  
δωνι υπερ Αλιρροθιου του Ποσει-  
δωνος· και ο τοπος εκληθη Αρειος  
Παγος. A quo lis Athenis  
intercessit Marti et Nep-  
tuno super Halirrhothio,  
Neptuni filio, et locus dic-  
tus est Arius Pagus.

Ερος. 4. Αφ ου κατα-  
κλυσμος επι Δευκαλιωνος εγενε-  
το, και Δευκαλιων τους ομβρους  
εφυγεν εγ Λυκωρειας εις Αθηνas  
προ[ς Κρανα]ον . . . και τα  
σωτηρια εθυσεν. A quo dilu-  
vium, tempore Deucalionis  
evenit; et Deucalion im-  
bres fugit è Lycoriâ, A-  
thenas ad Cranaüm, et sa-  
cra pro salute fecit.

‘Αλιρρόθιος ὁ Ποσειδῶνος ὑπο  
Αρεος φωραθείς κτείνεται· Πο-  
σειδῶν δὲ ἐν Αρείῳ Παγῷ κρινε-  
ται, δικάζοντων τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν,  
Αρει, καὶ [οὗτος] ἀπολύεται \*.  
Halirrothius, Neptuni f. à  
Marte deprehensus occidi-  
tur. Quamobrem Nep-  
tunus Martem in Areopago  
cædis reum agit. Is duo-  
decim deorum sententiâ ju-  
dicatus absolvitur. Apol-  
lod. l. iii. c. 13. § 2. edit.  
1675. c. 14. edit. 1782.  
Αρειος Παγος εκληθη. Syncell.  
p. 153. Euseb. Chron. p.  
110.

Εφ’ ου τον επι Δευκαλιωνος  
λεγεται κατακλυσμον γενεσθαι  
. . . τῷ Παρνασσῷ προσισχει,  
καὶ τῶν ομβρῶν παύσαν λα-  
βόντων, ἐμβας ἐθύσε Διὶ Φυξίῳ.  
Sub quo [Cranao] Deuca-  
lionis diluvium fuisse nar-  
ratur . . . . Parnassum de-  
mum appellit, ibique cūm  
imbres desissent, egressus,  
Jovi Phyxio sacris opera-

\* Scaliger, having observed, that this passage is corrupt and im-  
perfect, says, the author means : Ποσειδῶνος δὲ εἰσαγοντος, ἐν Αρείῳ  
Παγῷ κρινεται, δικάζοντων τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν, Αρει, καὶ ἀπολύεται. Scal. in  
Euseb. Chron. p. 31. Gale gives the text, as it is here cited, and  
subjoins this remark : Græci sic loquuntur, κρινεται Αρει, disceptat  
cum Marte. Not. in loc.

tur. Apollod. l. iii. c. 13.  
§ 5. c. 14. edit. 1782. Id.  
l. i. c. 7. § 2.

This account of Deucalion, in the Parian Chronicle, is not consistent with what we find in some of the principal writers of antiquity.

Herodotus, Apollodorus, Conon, Strabo, Ovid, Justin, Eusebius, and others, affirm, that at the time of the deluge, Deucalion reigned in Thessaly\*.

Apollodorus relates, that the mountains of Thessaly were divided or torn asunder by the flood†; and that Deucalion, after being carried along nine days and nights upon the water, landed at last on Parnassus, and THERE offered sacrifices to Jupiter Phyxius.

There are some improbabilities attending the story, as it is told in the Chronicle. 1. The deluge is supposed to have happened 45 years after Deucalion began his reign in Lycoria. 2. Lycoria, according to Pausanias, was a city, built on the top of Parnassus, by those, who had escaped the deluge; and consequently could not exist 45 years before that event. 3. It is scarcely probable, that Deucalion would leave the top of Parnassus, or Lycoria, where he is said to have been long settled, and go to another country, on this occasion, either for safety, or for the purpose of offering a sacrifice to Jupiter for his preservation. Lastly, if there had

\* Herod. l. i. c. 56. Apollod. l. i. c. 7. § 2. Conon, Narrat. 27. Strab. l. ix. p. 660. Ovid. Metam. l. i. v. 317. Just. l. ii. c. 6. Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 110. Hellanicus apud Schol. in Apoll. Rhod. l. iii. v. 1085.

† Τα ορη διεσπεν, montes dirempti sunt diluvio, recessere. These words are improperly rendered by Ægius Spoletinus, Gale, &c. montes aquarum diluvio immunes fieri. Vid. Herod. l. vii. c. 329. Strab. l. ix. p. 658. Sen. Nat. Quæst. vi. 25.



been any authority for saying, that Deucalion went to Athens, and there made his offering, and built a temple to Jupiter, it is hardly probable, that these two circumstances, so much to the honour of that city, would have been totally omitted by Apollodorus, an Athenian writer.

We are told indeed by Pausanias \*, that Deucalion lived for some time at Athens, and there built a temple to Jupiter Olympius, and had a sepulchre near the temple. But Pausanias only gives us the story of his building a temple, as an uncertain tradition, λεγουσι †; and Dionysius Halicarnasseus observes, that sepulchral monuments were frequently erected to eminent men, in places, where they were not buried ‡. This objection is entirely removed, if, as Meursius asserts, the temple at Athens, ascribed to Deucalion by Pausanias and Strabo ||, was not built by Deucalion king of Thessaly, but by Deucalion, the son of Minos, king of Crete §.

<p>Ερως. 6. Αφ ου Ελλην ο          Δευκ[αλιωνος Φθι]ωτιδος εβα-          σιλευσε, και Ελληνες [ων]ομασ-          θησαν το προτερον Γραικοι κα-          λουμενοι, και τον αγωνα πανα-          θ[η]ναι[κον συνεστησαντο.] Α</p>	<p>Αυτος μεν ουν [Ελλην] αφ'          αυτου τους καλουμενους Γραι-          κους προσηγορευσεν Ελληνας...          Εριχθονιος των Παναθηναιων την          εορτην συνεστησατο. Is qui-          dem de se Hellenas, qui</p>
---	---

\* Paus. l. x. c. 6.

† Id. l. i. c. 18.

‡ Dionys. Halic. l. i. p. 43.

|| Strab. l. ix. p. 651.

§ Meursius, having quoted the words of Pausanias, adds, “ De hoc Deucalione, Minois filio, locus iste capiendus, non de illo altero, Prometheo nato; sub quo celeberrimum id diluvium accidisse ferunt. Quin ætatem illic porro omnem egit; cùmque diem obiisset, prope extructum à se templum est sepultus. Meurs. Creta, l. iii. c. 3. p. 127.

quo Hellen Deucalionis f. in Phthiotide regnavit, & Hellenes appellati sunt, qui prius Græci dicebantur, et certamen Panatheniacum instituerunt \*.

*postea* † Græci vocati sunt, nominavit. . . . Erichthonius Panathenæorum celebritatem instituit. Apollod. l. i. c. 7. § 2. § 3. edit. 1782. l. iii. c. 13. § 6. c. 14. edit. 1782.

Επος. 28. Αφ ου Νη-  
[λ]ευσ ωκισ[εν εν Καρια Μιλη-  
τον, αγειρας Ιωνας, οι ωκισ]αν  
Εφεσον, Ερυθρας, Κλαζομενας,  
[Πριηνην, και Λεβεδον, Τεω]  
Κολοφων, [Μ]υουντα, [Φω-  
καιαν] Σαμον [Χιον, και] τα  
[Παν]ιωνι[α] εγενετο. A quo  
Neleus condidit in Ca-  
ria Miletum, congregatis  
Ionibus, qui condiderunt  
Ephesum, Erythras, Cla-  
zomenas, Prienen, et Lebe-  
dum, Teon, Colophonem,  
Myuntem, Phoccam, Sa-  
mum, Chium, Panionia in-  
stituta fuere.

Νηλευς δε εις την Ιωνιαν αφι-  
κετο, και πρωτον μεν ωκισε Μι-  
λητον, Καρας εξελασας . . . αφ'  
ων αι δωδεκα πολεις ειληθησαν εν  
Ιωνια. Εισι δε αιδε· Μιλητος,  
Εφεσος, Ερυθραι, Κλαζομεναι,  
Πριηνη, Λεβεδος, Τεως, Κολο-  
φων, Μυους, Φωκαια, Σαμος,  
και Χιος. Neleus autem  
pervenit in Ioniam, et pri-  
mum condidit Miletum, e-  
jectis Caribus, . . . à qui-  
bus duodecem Ioniæ civi-  
tates appellatæ sunt. Sunt  
autem hæ: Miletus, Ephe-  
sus, Erythræ, Clazomenæ,  
Priena, Lebedus, Teus, Co-  
lophon, Myûs, Phocæa, Sa-  
mus and Chius. Ælian:

\* The Panathenæa are said to have been first instituted by Erichthonius, fifteen years after the date of this epocha. See Επος x, and Apollod. loc. cit.

† Ægius Spoletinus and Dr. Gale insert the word *postea*; but it is a mistake instead of *antea* or *prius*. 'Οι καλουμενοι τετε μεν Γραικοι, νυν δε Έλληνες, qui tunc appellabantur Græci, nunc autem Hellenes. Arist. Meteor. l. i. c. 14. Γραικοι and γραικοι may perhaps signify *antiqui*, ancients, or old inhabitants.

Var. Hist. l. viii. c. 5. edit. Gronov. 1731.

The names of six, and, if the lacunæ are properly supplied, the names of twelve cities, appear to have been engraved on the marble, exactly as we find them in Ælian's Various History. But there is not any imaginable reason for this particular arrangement. It does not correspond with the time of their foundation, with their situation in Ionia, with their relative importance, or with the order, in which they are placed by other eminent historians.

These twelve cities are thus enumerated by Herodotus : Miletus, Myus, Priene, Ephesus, Colophon, Lebedus, Teos, Clazomenæ, Phocæa, Samos, Chios, Erythræ \*.

By Strabo : Ephesus, Miletus, Myus, Lebedus, Colophon, Priene, Teos, Erythræ, Phocæa, Clazomenæ, Chios, Samus †.

By Paterculus : Ephesus, Miletus, Colophon, Priene, Lebedus, Myus, Erythræ, Clazomenæ, Phocæa, Samos, Chios, &c. ‡.

By Pausanias : Miletus, Ephesus, Myus, Priene, Colophon, Lebedus, Teos, Erythræ, Clazomenæ, Phocæa, Samus, Chios §.

By Suidas : Ephesus, Miletus, Myus, Priene, Colophon, Teos, Lebedus, Erythræ, Phocæa, Clazomenæ, Chios, Samos §.

These cities are mentioned by some other ancient

\* Herod. l. i. c. 142.

† Strab. l. xiv. p. 938.

‡ V. Patere. l. i. c. 4.

§ Pausan. l. vii. c. 2—4.

§ Suidas in v. *Ionia*.—Suidas seems to have taken his list from Strabo, or Pausanias, with some little variation.



writers ; but not by any of them in the order, in which they are enumerated by Ælian \*, and the author of the Chronicle.

It is observable, that six names may be transposed 720 different ways ; and that twelve names admit of 479,001,600 different transpositions. Supposing then, that there is no particular reason for one arrangement rather than another, it will follow, that the chance of two authors, placing them in the same order, is, in the former case, as 1 to 720 ; and, in the latter, as 1 to 479,001,600.

It is therefore utterly improbable, that these names would have been placed in this order on the marble, if the author of the inscription had not transcribed them from the historian.

Ερος. 38. [Αφ ου Αμφικτυονες ενίκησαν ελ]οντες Κυρραν, και ο αγων ο γυμνικος ετεθη χρηματιτης απο των λαφυρων, ετη ΗΗ[Η]ΔΔΠΙΙ, αρχοντος Αθηνησι Σιμων[υ]ος. A quo Amphictyones vice-runt, captâ Cyrrhâ, et certamen gymnicum editum fuit pecuniarium ex spoliis, anni cccxxvii, archonte Athenis Simone.

Τον Πυθικον αγωνα διεθηκεν Ευρυλοχος ὁ Θεσσαλος, συν τοις Αμφικτυοσι, τους Χιρρᾶιους καταπολεμησας . . . επι αρχοντος Αθηνησι Σιμωνος, και νικησας εθετο χρηματικον αγωνα. Pythicum certamen instituit Eurylochus Theffalus, unâ cum Amphictyonibus, cum Cirrhæos debellasset... archonte Athenis Simone, victoriâque partâ chrematitem agonem decrevit. Pind. Schol. arg. 4. in Pyth. p. 163. edit. Oxon. 1697.

Ερος. 39. Αφ ου [ο σεφ]ανιτης αγων παλιν ετεθη, ετη

Επι μεν Αθηνησιν αρχοντος Δαμασιου, ὑστερον και σεφανιτην

† Ælian wrote about the year aft. Chr. 225. Saxii Onom.



ΗΗΗΔ[Δ]ΙΙ, αρχοντος Α-  
θηνησι Δαμασίου του δευτερου.  
A quo coronarium certa-  
men iterum editum fuit,  
anni cccxxii, archonte A-  
thenis Damasiâ secundo.

Επος. 52. Αφ ου Ξερξης  
την σχεδιαν εξευξεν εν Ελλησ-  
ποντω, και τον Αθω διωρυξε.  
A quo Xerxes navigiorum  
pontem junxit in Helle-  
ponte, & Athonem perfo-  
dit.

Επος. 53. Και το πυρ ε-  
ρρη[σε εν Σικ]ελια, περι την  
Αιτυαν \*. Et ignis defluxit  
in Sicilia circa Ætnam.

εθεντο. Archonte Athenis  
quidem Damasiâ, iterum co-  
ronarium statuerunt. Pind.  
Schol. arg. 2. in Pyth.

Ξερξης διωρυξε και τον Αθω,  
εξευξε και τον Έλλησποντον.  
Xerxes perfodit et Athon,  
& Hellepontum ponte  
junxit. Suidas v. Ξερξης.  
Vid. Isoc. Paneg. p. 127,  
edit. Cantab. 1686.

Ερρη δε περι αυτο το εαρ  
τουτο ο ρυαξ του πυρος ει της  
Αιτης. Per idem ver ignis  
rivus ex Ætnâ effluxit †.  
Thucyd. l. iii. sub fin.

The eruption of mount Ætna, which Thucydides mentions in this passage, happened in the archonship of Euthydemus, bef. Chr. 426. In the next sentence, he speaks of another eruption, πεντηκωστω ετει, fifty years before; that is, when Phædon was archon, in the year 476, or, according to the opinion of Corfini, when Dromoclides was archon, in 475. This is the eruption, mentioned by the author of the Chronicle; but he places it three or four years too early, in the archonship of Xanthippus, bef. Chr. 479.

\* Αιτυαν. Αιτυα for Αιτη, Dor. but the ι in Αιτυαν is a mistake, either of the author, or the stone-cutter.

† This passage is only produced as an imitation, or something like an imitation, of a writer, preceding the cxxix Olympiad.

<p>Ερος. 58. Αφ ου εν Αι- γος ποταμοις ο λιθος επεσε. A quo in Ægos flumen lapis cecidit.</p>	<p>Λιθος εκ του ουρανου επεσεν εν ποταμοις Αιγος. Lapis in Ægis fluvio de cœlo ruit. Euseb. Chron. p. 168. 131.</p>
---	---

It is worthy of observation, how the ancients differ with respect to the place, from which this stone is supposed to have fallen. Aristotle says, it was snatched up by a whirlwind, and fell *εκ του αερος*, out of the air \*. Pliny and Diogenes Laertius assert, that it fell *εκ του ηλιου*, from the sun †. Silenus, Plutarch, Philostratus, Eusebius, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Tzetzes ‡, tell us, that it fell *εκ του ουρανου*, from the sky. Our author contents himself with saying, that it fell into the river Ægos. Does not this deviation from the opinion, and the language of the ancients, seem to encourage a suspicion, that the writer of the Chronicle lived in later times, when men had learned to explode such an absurdity, as that of a stone, as big as a mill-stone, falling

\* Arist. Meteor. l. i. c. 7.

† Plin. l. ii. c. 58.—Pliny says, it was, magnitudine vehis, a cart-load.—Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 10.

‡ Silenus apud Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 11. In this passage Scaliger reads *διμυλον λιθον*, a stone as large as two mill-stones. Scal. Animad. in Euseb. Chron. p. 102. Kühnius thus reprobates the word *διμυλον*: “*μυλου λιθος idem est quod μολιτης, molaris; διμυλος λιθος verò æque absurdum est, ac si dicerem τριμυλος.*” Kühnii Observ. in loc.

Plut. in v. Lyfand. p. 439.—Plutarch calls it, *παρμεγεθης λιθος*, a very large stone.

Philostr. in v. Apollon. l. i. c. 2.—This writer says, *λιθοι*, stones. Euseb. loc. cit.

Am. Marcell. l. xxii. p. 212. 236.—Marcellinus says, *lapides*, stones.

Tzet. Chil. vi.—Tzetzes likewise says, *λιθοι*, stones.

out of the air, from the sun, from the sky, or from heaven?

If, upon considering these parallel passages, it should appear, that they really exhibit a similarity of sentiment and expression, which could not result from chance, it will be necessary to enquire, from what source this coincidence arises.

It is not probable, that the historians, geographers, and miscellaneous writers of antiquity, living in different ages, and in distant countries, would, in cases of no particular importance, incidentally introduced, use the words of an inscription in the island of Paros. And if, in some instances, they might have borrowed the words of such an inscription, it is not probable, that they would have deviated from the general custom of their contemporaries, by suppressing the name of the author, whose expressions they adopted, and on whose authority they depended.

2. It is not probable, that the inscription has been copied by several writers, particularly by writers, who lived many centuries after its date; because, upon this supposition, it must have been generally known and consulted; which is so far from being the case, that there is not an author now remaining, who appears to have either seen or heard of such an inscription.

3. It is not probable, that the inscription was collected from preceding writers, as early as the cxxix Olympiad; and that others have drawn their information from the same original sources, and therefore employed the same expressions; first, because it is generally acknowledged\*, that the Greeks, at that time, had no idea of any regular, chronological system, like the Parian Chronicle; and secondly, because we can hardly

\* See chap. v. vi.

suppose, that Greek writers of eminent abilities have servilely copied the words of their predecessors, on ordinary occasions, where they have not appealed to their authority. Professed compilers must be excepted.

I am very sensible, how difficult it is, in many cases, to trace resemblances, and fix upon unquestionable imitations, in different authors; but if there be any such imitations in the passages I have cited, and any validity in the subsequent observations, we may conclude, that the facts and dates, contained in the Parian Chronicle, have been collected, by some modern writer, from the historical records of antiquity.



C H A P. XIII.

VII. **P**ARACHRONISMS appear in some of the epochas, which we can scarcely suppose a Greek chronologer, in the cxxix Olympiad, would be liable to commit.

The following articles, among many others, which might be mentioned, seem to fall under this imputation.

In the 31st Epocha, Pheidon the Argive, supposed to have been the eleventh from Hercules, is said to have made weights and measures, 895 years before the Christian æra.

There seems to be a considerable prochronism in this article. Eusebius and Syncellus place Pheidon in the year 800 \*. Pausanias tells us, that Pheidon was a formidable tyrant, and interposed in a contest between the Eleans and the Pisæans, about the direction of the Olympic games, in the eighth Olympiad †, bef. Chr. 748. Strabo says, Pheidon himself assumed the power of superintending the games; but that he was soon afterwards deposed by the Eleans and Spartans. He makes him the tenth from Temenus ‡, who was unquestionably the fourth from Hercules.

Pheidon

\* Euseb. Chron. p. 112. Ibid. Græc. 148. Syncell. p. 198.

† Pausan. l. vi. c. 22.

‡ Δεκάτην μὲν οὐκ ἀπὸ Τημενου, decimum à Temeno. Strab. l. viii. p. 549. edit. 1707.—In the *Latin* translation of this passage, Pheidon is called, decimus ab HERCULE; for which, I think, there is

Pheidon was brother to Caranus, who founded the kingdom of Macedon. Chronologers are not agreed concerning the beginning of this prince's reign ; but the most probable opinion seems to be that of archbishop Usher, who places it about the year 794.

Paterculus brings Caranus, and consequently Pheidon, two generations lower than Strabo has done ; for he says, he was the SIXTEENTH from Hercules \*.

Sir Isaac Newton supposes Pheidon to have lived in the year 584 ; which is 311 years later, than the marble has placed him.

ΕΡΟC. 46. According to this epocha, the assassination of Hipparchus, and the expulsion of his brother Hippias, or that of the Pisistratidæ, happened in the same year. But it is universally agreed, that Hippias remained at Athens above three years after the death of his brother.

“ The Athenians,” says Herodotus, “ during the space of FOUR years, were no less oppressed by tyranny than before †.” Plato makes this an interval of THREE years ‡. Thucydides, with historical accuracy, says, “ Hippias continued in possession of the tyranny at Athens THREE years ; and in the FOURTH was deposed

no authority, but that of Xylander, who reads *Ἡρακλεους*, instead of *Τημενου*. Vid. Palmerii Exercit. p. 308.

Temenus was one of the three brothers, who conducted the celebrated expedition, called the Return of the Heraclidæ, bef. Chr. 1104. If Pheidon was ten generations, or 300 years, later, he must be supposed to have lived about the year 804.

\* Sextus decimus ab Hercule. Paterc. l. i. c. 6.

† *Ἐπ' ἑτεα τεσσαερα*, per annos quatuor. Herod. l. v. § 55.

‡ Quo defuncto, *τρια ετη*, tres annos sub fratre illius Hippia, tyrannide pressi Athenienses fuerunt. Plat. in Hipparcho, vol. v. p. 263. edit. Bipont. 1784.

by the Lacedæmonians and the Alcæonidæ, twenty years before the battle at Marathon\*.

ΕΡΟC. 50. The author of the Chronicle asserts, that Darius, the son of Hyſtaſpes, died in the archonſhip of ARISTIDES, the year after the battle at Marathon.

Cteſias indeed relates, that “Darius returned into Perſia, and died there, after an illneſs of thirty days†. But every one knows, how much the credit of Cteſias has been ſuſpected‡; beſides, the death of Darius is mentioned, in a mere EPITOME of his hiſtory by Photius,

\* ΕΝ Τῷ ΤΕΤΑΡΤῳ, quarto anno. Thucyd. I. vi. § 59.—Hipparchus was aſſaſinated, Olymp. LXVI. 3. bef. Chr. 514. Hippias was baniſhed, Olymp. LXVII. 2. bef. Chr. 510. Hippiæ fuga in exente anno ſecundo Olymp. LXVII conſitui debet. Corin. Valeſii Excerpt. Peireſc. p. 42.

† Δαρειος δὲ ἐπαλειθὼν εἰς Περſας, καὶ θύſας, καὶ ἡμέρας νοſηſας λ', τελευτα, Darius autem ad Perſias reverſus eſt, ubi celebratis ſacrificiis, quum triginta dies morbo laboraſſet, mortuus eſt. Cteſiæ Fragm. apud Phot. Bibl. cod. 72. Herod. Op. p. 816. edit. 1763.

‡ Μυθῶν ἀπίſτα, καὶ παραφορῶν ἐμβέβληκεν εἰς τὰ βιβλία παντοδαπὴν πύλαιον, fabularum abſurdarum et inuſſarum in libros ſuos variam colluviam inſarſit. Plut. in v. Artax. p. 1012.

Κτεſίας οὐκ ἀξιοπῖςτος, Cteſias non ſide dignus. Ariſt. Hiſt. Animal. I. viii. c. 28.

In this paſſage Ariſtotele alludes to the INDICA of Cteſias. But might not Cteſias as well forge his Aſſyrian hiſtory, as create the world of monſters he talks of in India? And might we not as juſtly ſuſpect him of falſhood, when he pretends, that he compiled his hiſtory from original records, as when he gravely affirms, that he was an eye-witneſs of what no perſon of ſenſe can believe? Vid. Cteſiæ Indica apud Photium, cod. 73.

Herodotus, ſay the authors of the Universal Hiſtory, may be juſtly ſtyled the father of hiſtory, and agrees better with the ſacred writings than any other profane hiſtorian; whereas it will be difficult to find a more romantic and fabulous author than Cteſias, in the whole circle of antiquity, vol. xx. p. 84. edit. 1747. See alſo vol. iv. p. 265.



in such vague and general terms, as do not, by any means, ascertain the time of that event.

Herodotus says expressly, "In the FOURTH year after the battle at Marathon, when Darius had assembled the best of his forces, in order to invade Greece, the Egyptians, who had been subdued by Cambyfes, revolted from the Persians \*." And a little afterwards, he adds, "Darius died the year after the revolt of Egypt †:" that is, inclusively, the FIFTH year after the battle at Marathon, or the year bef. Chr. 486. Other authors corroborate the testimony of Herodotus ‡.

Diodorus Siculus informs us, that Xerxes, the son and successor of Darius, was assassinated in the fourth year of the LXXVIII Olympiad, bef. Chr. 465 years. This prince reigned 21 years || : consequently his father must have died in the year 486.

Sir

\* Τεταρτῷ ετεῖ, quarto anno Ægyptii defecerunt. Herod. l. vii. § 1.

† Τῷ ὑστέρῳ ετεῖ, proximo anno ab Ægyptiorum defectione. Ibid. § 4.

‡ Several writers speak of the great preparations, which Darius had made for renewing the war. These must have taken up a considerable time.

Δαρείος, πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς, παρασκευὰς πεποιημένους μεγάλων ὀπλισμάτων, Darius ante mortem magnarum copiarum apparatus fecerat. Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 2.

Darius cùm bellum restauraret in ipso apparatu decedit. Just. l. ii. c. 10.

Darius ante QUADRIENNIIUM quàm decederet, apud Marathonum pugnavit. Sulp. Sev. l. ii. c. 13.

Darius, cùm instauraret bellum, in ipso apparatu concidit, Olympiade septuagesimâ quartâ. Oros. l. ii. c. 8.—According to Orosius, Darius died bef. Chr. 484, six years after the battle of Marathon.

|| Βασιλευσας των Περσων ετη πλειον των εικοσι, postquam ultra xx annos Persarum regno præfuisset. Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 53.



Sir Isaac Newton observes, that “Darius began his reign in the spring, anno J. Per. 4193, bef. Chr. 521, and reigned THIRTY-SIX years, by the unanimous consent of all chronologers\*.”——“The reign of this prince,” he says, “is determined by two eclipses of the moon, observed at Babylon, and recorded by Ptolemy; so that it cannot be disputed. The former was in the twentieth year of Darius, *an.* J. P. 4212, Nov. 19, at 11<sup>h</sup> 45’ at night; the latter in the twenty-first year of the same prince, *an.* J. P. 4223, Apr. 25, at 11<sup>h</sup> 30’ at night. Xerxes began his reign in the spring, *an.* J. P. 4229, bef. Chr. 485; for Darius died in the FIFTH year after the battle at Marathon, as Herodotus, l. vii. and Plutarch mention; and that battle was *an.* J. P. 4224, ten years before the battle at Salamis †.”

Xerxes having determined to revenge the disgrace, received by his father at Marathon, spent four years in preparing for the invasion of Greece. In the FIFTH ‡ year he began his march, and passed the winter at Sardes. In the succeeding spring ||, bef. Chr. 480, he crossed the Hellespont, and brought his forces into Eu-

Ξεξξξς ετη χά, Xerxes ann. xxi. Maneth. apud Euseb. Chron. p. 17. & apud Syncell. p. 75, 76. Vid. p. 208.

\* Βασιλευσαντα τα παντα ετεα εξ τε και τριηκοντα, sex et triginta annis regni expletis. Herod. l. vii. § 4.

Δαξξξς ετη λς’, Darius ann. xxxvi. Maneth. apud Euseb. Chron. Græc. p. 17. African. apud Syncell. p. 75. Vid. Syncell. p. 78. 208.

Ctesias pretends, that Darius obtained the kingdom of Persia at twelve years of age, and reigned twenty-one years. Ctesiae Fragm. loc. cit.—But when the former of these numbers is so manifestly erroneous, what dependence can we place upon the latter?

† Newt. Observ. on Daniel. c. 10. p. 141.

‡ Πεντητην δε ετει ανομενῶν, quinto autem anno incunte. Herod. l. vii. § 20.

|| Αμα τῷ εαρι, incunte vere. Herod. l. viii. § 37.

rope.

rope. He engaged Leonidas at Thermopylæ, about the beginning of the month Hecatombæon\*, and arrived at Athens, about the end of the same month. On the twentieth of Boëdromion, the Greeks obtained the celebrated victory at Salamis.

According to this account, which is clearly stated by Herodotus, Xerxes employed FIVE years in his military preparations for the invasion of Greece. Justin and Orosius † agree with Herodotus in this particular. Eusebius likewise places the battle of Salamis in the FIFTH year of Xerxes ‡. Diodorus mentions a preparation of three years || ; and if we add the time which Xerxes spent in subduing the Egyptians, his account will coincide with that of Herodotus.

In opposition to all these testimonies, the author of the Chronicle affirms, that Xerxes succeeded to the throne of Persia NINE years before the battle of Salamis.

ΕΡΟC. 51. The author places the birth of Euripides 486 years before the Christian æra.

Diogenes Laertius places it in the first year of the LXXV Olympiad, when Calliades was archon, bef. Chr. 480 ; and Thomas Magister, in the same Olympiad. Plutarch, Hesychius, Suidas, and others, likewise affirm,

\* Vide Corfini Fast. Attic. tom. iii. p. 165. Herodotus says, "The barbarians spent a month in passing the Hellespont, and bringing their forces into Europe; and in three months more entered Attica, when Calliades was archon of the Athenians." Lib. viii. § 51.

† Xerxes bellum à patre cœptum adversus Græciam per quinquennium instruxit. Just. l. ii. c. 10. Per quinquennium instruxit. Oros. l. ii. c. 9.

‡ Euseb. Chron. p. 130.

|| Τριετη χρόνον παρεσκευασάμενος. Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 2.

that Euripides was born the very day, on which the Greeks defeated the Persians at Salamis \*.

On the authority of these writers we may reasonably conclude, that there is a parachronism of five or six years, in this epocha.

ΕΡΟC. 54. In this epocha it is asserted, that Gelo became tyrant of Syracuse, two years AFTER the battle at Thermopylæ; whereas we are assured by the most eminent historians, that he had obtained the government of that city several years BEFORE Xerxes invaded Greece.

Diodorus informs us, that Gelo reigned SEVEN years, and DIED within two years after the battle abovementioned; that is, he became tyrant of Syracuse, in the year bef. Chr. 484, and died in 478 †. Aristotle likewise ascribes seven years to the tyranny of Gelo ‡. Pausanias relates, that Gelo was tyrant of Syracuse in the second year of the LXXII Olympiad, TEN years before the transit of Xerxes §. Though this writer seems to have mistaken Syracuse for Gela §, his testimony is totally repugnant to that of the Chronicle; for in another place, he positively asserts, that Gelo was tyrant of Syracuse, when Xerxes came into Europe ¶.

Diodorus, Ephorus, Herodotus, unanimously affirm, that the Greeks sent ambassadors to Gelo, as KING of

\* Diog. Laert. in v. Socrat. l. ii. § 45.

ΕΠΙ ΚΑΛΛΙΩ [lege ΚΑΛΛΙΑΔΟΥ] ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ, ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΠΕΡΙΠΤΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΣΤΗΝ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑΔΑ. Th. Magist. in v. Eurip.

Plut. in Sympof. l. viii. c. 1. Hesychius Milesius de Viris claris, in v. ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΗΣ. Suidas, &c.

† Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 30.

‡ Arist. Repub. l. v. c. 12.

§ Pausan. l. vi. c. 9.

§ Vid. Dionys. Halic. l. vii. § 1.

¶ Pausan. l. viii. c. 42.



SYRACUSE, to solicit his assistance against the Persians, when Xerxes was preparing for his intended expedition \*.

It may be presumed, that Diodorus, a native of Sicily, was well acquainted with the records of his own country; and Herodotus, with the public transactions of his own time. It is certainly in the highest degree improbable, that Diodorus, Ephorus, and Herodotus, should be deceived, in a circumstance, which was rendered particularly remarkable by a formal embassy from the united States of Greece: for surely there must have been public records, and other authentic memorials, of this late and important transaction.

We may therefore conclude, that the author of the Chronicle has mistaken the time of Gelo's accession, for that of his decease, and placed the former under the archonship of Timosthenes, bef. Chr. 478. where he should have placed the latter. By this parachronism he has postponed the succession of Hiero to the year 472, which is six years later, than Diodorus and other historians have placed him †.

ΕΡΟC. 65. Here we are told, that the younger Cyrus ἀνεβ... when Callias was archon; i. e. in the third year of the xciii Olympiad, bef. Chr. 406.

I can hardly suppose, that this passage refers to the visit, which Cyrus made his father in his last illness; or to his attempt to assassinate his brother at his coronation. It is scarcely probable, that the author of the Chronicle would record either of these unimportant circumstances, and say nothing of that memorable expe-

\* Diod. Sic. l. xi. § 1. Ephor. apud Schol. Pind. Pyth. i. p. 175. Ω βασιλεὺς Συρακουσίων, κ. τ. λ., Herod. l. vii. § 161.—Corfini places this embassy in the second year BEFORE the battle at Thermopylae.

† Diod. Sic. l. xi. p. 30.



dition, in which this young prince marched at the head of thirteen thousand Greeks, and a hundred thousand barbarians, to dispute the crown of Persia with Artaxerxes.

If these remaining letters *αυεβ* . . . relate to this expedition, usually styled the Anabasis, here is a prochronism of FIVE years ; for it commenced in the archonship of Exænetus or Xenænetus\*, in the fourth year of the xcliv Olympiad, bef. Chr. 401, above five years after the date, specified in the Chronicle.

The lxvii epocha mentions only the RETURN of the ten thousand Greeks.

Upon a presumption, that the dates of these, or, at least, some of these events are carelessly and erroneously stated in the Chronicle, we may ask, Would a writer of reputation and learning, in one of the most polished and enlightened æras of ancient Greece, commit such mistakes, in opposition to the positive attestations of the most accurate historians, in events of PUBLIC NOTORIETY ? Would a private citizen, or a magistrate of Paros, order a crude and inaccurate series of epochas to be engraved, at a great expence, and transmitted to posterity on a marble monument ?—It is hardly probable.

\* *Ξενοφώνι ἀνέβησκει σὺν Κυρῷ ἐπὶ ἀρχόντῳ Ξεναίνετου*, Xenophon ascendit cum Cyro sub archonte Xenæneto. Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 55. —Diodorus places the Anabasis under the same archon. l. xiv. p. 249. The learned author of a Dissertation, subjoined to Spelman's translation of Xenophon's Anabasis, is of opinion, that the year of the expedition was the third year of the xciv Olympiad, bef. Chr. 402.

C H A P. XIV.

VIII. **T**HE discovery of the Chronicle is related in a very obscure and unsatisfactory manner, with some suspicious circumstances, and without any of those clear and unequivocal evidences, which always discriminate truth from falsehood.

It is remarkable, that the place, where it was found, is not ascertained.

The generality of writers, who have had occasion to mention it, have supposed, that it was found in the island of Paros.

Thus Du Pin : “ We have no monument, from which we can, with more certainty, fix the Attic æra, or the beginning of the reign of Cecrops, than the Chronicle, found in the isle of Paros \*.”

Du Fresnoy observes, that “ the Parian Chronicle takes its name from the island of Paros, in the Archipelago, where it was found †.”

Dr. Rawlinson, in a note to his translation of Du Fresnoy’s *Méthode pour étudier l’Histoire*, affirms, “ that these marbles were found in the island of Paros, one of the Cyclades ‡.”

\* Du Pin, Univ. Hist. Libr. tom. ii. l. i. p. 271.

† Elle tire son nom de l’île de Paros, l’une de celles de l’Archipel, où cette Chronique fut *trouvée*, au commencement du xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle. Du Fresnoy, Tabl. Chron. tom. i. p. clxvii. edit. 1742.

‡ New Method of studying History, vol. i. c. 2. § 3. p. 36.

Abbé Banier asserts, “that these marbles were dug up in the island of Paros \*.”

Others tell us, that they were not found at Paros, but in Asia Minor, at Smyrna.

Palmerius, who wrote a comment upon them, affirms, that “they were found at Smyrna, a celebrated city of Ionia †.”

Petavius says expressly, “they were DUG OUT of the ground at Smyrna ‡.”

If we consult the editors of the *Marmora Arundelliana*, we shall find no satisfaction in this particular.

Selden, in commenting on the words *ἐν Πάρῳ*, in the second line, only says, “We may reasonably CONJECTURE, that the author was a Parian || ;” but he does not once mention the place, where the Chronicle is supposed to have been found.

Prideaux is perfectly silent on this point.

Maittaire speaks of this fragment, as if he had not known where it was discovered. “Præterea,” says he,

\* CES MARBRES furent *déterrées* dans l'isle de Paros, & vendus au Comte d'Arondel. Banier, *Mythol.* tom. vi. p. 62. edit. Par. 1740.—This writer, and many others, suppose the Chronicle to have been written on a series of several pieces of marble. At present, there is only a shattered fragment remaining; but it is most probable, that the whole inscription was originally engraved on one tablet. Selden, who saw the greatest part of it, speaks of it in the singular number: *epocharum marmor, chronologicum marmor, &c.* edit. Ansa, p. iii. vid. *supra*, p. 53. n.

† Ea marmorum fragmenta inventa sunt Smyrnæ, quæ civitas erat inter Ionicas insignis. Palmer. *Exercit. ad Chron. Marm. Arundel.* p. 682.

‡ Antiquus ille chronologus, qui ex Arundellianis marmoribus, apud Smyrnam EFFOSSIS, nuper editus est. Petav. *Rat. Temp.* par. ii. l. ii. c. 9.

|| Autorem hinc Parium fuisse, æquum est ut conjectemus. Seid. *Marm. Arundel.* p. 72.

“ hoc

“ hoc marmor Smyrnæ magis, quàm in ULLA ALIA Asiæ parte, inventum fuisse, NON LIQUET \*.”

Dr. Chandler BELIEVES it was found at Paros, and afterwards removed to Smyrna. “Marmor Chronicon, in insulâ Paro, UT FAS SIT CREDERE, repertum, dein ad Smyrnam translatum †.”

This is the last account we have of the Parian inscription.

On these evidences we may observe, that neither Du Pin, Du Fresnoy, Banier, Palmerius, nor Petavius, appear to have received any certain information, relative to the place, where the Chronicle was discovered; at least, they are not consistent in their accounts; and yet, as we shall see hereafter, it was purchased at Smyrna by one of their countrymen.

Selden’s *ÆQUUM EST UT CONJECTEMUS*, Maittaire’s *NON LIQUET*, and Chandler’s *UT FAS SIT CREDERE*, leave us totally in the dark.

In the inscription itself we have no data, by which we can any ways discover the place, where the marble was erected,

Palmerius conceives, that the author or the stone-cutter was an Ionian. *Εἰως*, he says, is the Ionian dialect for *ἕως*, *ἐμ Παρῶ* for *ἐν Παρῶ*, and *ἐγ Λυκωρείας* for *ἐκ Λυκωρείας* ‡.

But Maittaire observes, that *εἰως* is the poetic dialect, frequently used by Homer ||; that *ἐμ* and *ἐγ* are mere archaisms, very common in ancient inscriptions §; and that,

\* Maitt. Marm. Arund. p. 571.

† Chand. Marm. Oxon. p. x.

‡ Palmer. Exercit. ad Chron. p. 682.

|| *εἰως* is used for *ἕως*, Il. iii. 291. xi. 342. 488. xii. 141, & alibi passim.

§ Hunc chronographum fuisse Ionem, ut credam, minimè inducar, quòd *ἐμ παρῶ* pro *ἐν παρῶ*, et *ἐγ λυκωρείας* pro *ἐκ λυκωρείας*, scrip-



that, from such expressions as these we cannot infer, that the Chronicle was composed at Smyrna.

If this monument was erected in that city, for what purpose does the writer mention Aſtynax, the archon of Paros, and not one circumstance relative to Smyrna?

If it was erected at Paros, why does he not mention more archons of that city than one? Or how shall we account for his profound silence, with respect to all the events and revolutions, which must have happened in that island, and have been infinitely more interesting to the natives, than the transactions of any foreign country?

Sir Thomas Roe, who was ambassador at Constantinople, and whose letters, from the year 1621 to 1628, inclusive, are published under the title of NEGOTIATIONS, corresponded with lord Arundel on the subject of ancient manuscripts, coins, statues, and inscriptions; and, at the same time, recommended and assisted Mr. Petty, whom the earl had sent into Asia for the purpose of collecting antiquities; yet in his letters to his lordship, relative to the discoveries made by Mr. Petty, he does not once mention the Parian Chronicle.

In a letter to lord Arundel, dated, Constantinople, Jan. 20—30, 1624, Sir Thomas acknowledges the receipt of three letters from his lordship, in recommendation of Mr. Petty, sent by the earl in search of antiquities. He informs him, that he doubts he will find little worthy of his pains in those rude parts, “where barbarism has trodden out all worthy reliques of antiquity;” that he may find some few medals or coins; but that books have been so often visited, that Duck-lane is better furnished than the Greek church; that Mr. Marsham, by his assistance, had ransacked the country

serit; quippe hæc magis ad archaïsmum, quàm ad Ionismum spectant . . . . Nisi fallor, u pro e, et ov pro o, poetarum magis propria sunt, quamvis hæc usurpent frequentissimè etiam Iones. Maitt. Marm. Arund. p. 571. 615. 638.

for statues, columns, and antique works; that he had lately fallen into a way of meeting with some rare statues from Alexandria, by means of the patriarch, particularly of a negro of black marble, a piece not to be matched; that the said patriarch has given him for his majesty, with expresse promise to deliver it, “an autographal Bible entire, written by the hand of Tecla, the protomartyr of the Greekes, who lived in the time of St. Paul; and he doth averr that to bee true and authentically, of his owne writing, and the greatest antiquitye of the Greeke church \*.”

\* Negot. let. 241. p. 334.—This was the famous Alexandrian MS.

In a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, dated Feb. 17—27, 1626, Sir Thomas speaks of it in the following terms: “The patriarch also, this new yeare’s tyde, sent mee the old Bible, formerly presented to his late majestie; which hee hath now dedicated to the kyng, and will send with that an epistle, as I thincke he hath signified to your grace, at least I will presume to mention it to his majestie. What estimation it may be of, is above my skill; but he valeswes that as the greatest antiquitye of the Greek church. The lettre is very fayre, a character that I have neuer seene. It is entyre, except the beginning of St. Matheiw. He doth testefye under his hand, that it was written by the virgin Tecla, daughter of a famous Greeke called *Αβγιεριενος* (stella matutina) who founded the monestarye in Egypt vpon Pharoas tower, a deuout and learned mayd, who was persecuted in Asya, and to whom Gregorye Nazianzen hath written many epistoles. At the end wherof, vnder the same hand, are the epistoles of Clement. She dyed not long after the councell of Nice. The booke is very great, and hath antiquitye enough at sight. I doubt not his majestie will esteeme it for the hand by whom it is presented.” let. 448. p. 618.

Who, in the name of wonder, was this famous Greek, called *ABGIERIENOS*?

The patriarch wanted to magnify the importance of his present when he talked in this manner!—The council of Nice was held in 325. Gregory Nazianzen flourished about the year 370. But lord Arundel was told, that the devout and learned writer lived in the time of St. Paul!—One story is as credible as the other.

In

In the next letter to lord Arundel, dated Oct. 20—30, 1625, he says, “Mr. Petty hath visited Pergamo, Samos, Ephesus, and some other places, where hee hath made your lordship greate prouisions, though hee lately wrote to mee, hee had found nothing of worth \*.”

In a subsequent letter to the earl, dated, Mar. 28, 1626, O. S. he says : “My last letters brought your lordship the advice of Mr. Pettye’s shipwracke, and losses vpon the coast of Asya, returning from Samos . . . Although hee will not boast to mee, yett I am informed, hee hath gotten many things rare and ancient. There was neuer man so fitted to an employment, that encounters all accidents with so vnwearied patience ; eates with Greekes on their worst dayes ; lies with fishermen on plancks, at the best ; is all things to all men, that hee may obteyne his ends, which are your lordship’s service. Hee is gone to Athens, whither also I have sent †.”

This is the last letter, in the Collection, from Sir Thomas Roe to lord Arundel.

In a letter to the duke of Buckingham, dated, Constantinople, Nov. 5—15, 1626, he says : “Mr. Petty hath raked together 200 pieces, all broken, or few entyre ; what they will prove I cannot judge. Hee had this advantage, that hee went himselfe into all the islands, and tooke all hee saw ; and is now gone to Athens, where I haue had an agent nine monethes ‡.”

In another letter to the duke of Buckingham, dated, Apr. 15, 1628, Sir Thomas gives his grace but a very indifferent idea of Mr. Petty’s collections.

“I could haue LADEN SHIPPS with such stones as Mr. Petty diggs ; but GOOD THINGS undefaced are

\* Negot. let. 315. p. 444.

† Negot. let. 413 p. 570.

‡ Negot. let. 359. p. 495.



rare, or rather NOT to be FOUND. Our search hath made many poore men INDUSTRIOUS to rippe up old ruines \*.”

These are most probably the real sentiments of Sir Thomas Roe, with respect to Mr. Petty's discoveries, which he would scarcely have expressed with so much freedom to lord Arundel.

Mr. Petty's name is mentioned in several other letters; but there is not, in any of them, the least intimation of the Parian Chronicle; which is a remarkable circumstance. For, supposing it to be authentic, it was a most valuable monument of ancient learning; and must surely have occasioned much conversation at Smyrna, and other places in that country; more especially as we shall find, that it had been EXPOSED TO SALE, before it fell into the hands of Mr. Petty.

Gassendus, in his Life of M. de Peiresc †, gives us the following account of its first discovery.

“ Per idem tempus accepit [Peirescius] aureum eruditi Seldeni librum, de Arundellianis Marmoribus, sive faxis Græcè incisís, quæ perillustri ille comes transferri ex Asiâ in Angliam, hortósq̃ue suos, curaverat. Ac memorare quidem par est, marmora illa fuisse primùm operâ Peireskii detecta, crutaque, persolutis aureis quinquaginta, per Samsonem quendam, ipsius negotia Smyrnæ procurantem; & convehenda cum jam essent, nescio quâ venditorum arte, Samsonem conjectum in carcerem fuisse, marmoraque ipsa interea distracta. Sed et illud addendum est, maximoperè lætatum Peireskium, cùm accepit, præclaras illas antiquitatis reliquias in

\* Negot. let. 611. p. 808.

† Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc, counsellor in the parliament of Provence, was an eminent patron of arts and learning, and corresponded with almost all the literati of his time. He died at Aix in 1637, in the fifty-seventh year of his age.



tanti herois incidisse manus ; ac tantò magis, quantò agnovit, Seldènem, veterem amicum, eas feliciter illustrasse.

“ Scilicet, cui unicus scopus utilitas publica fuit, nihil putavit interesse, seu sua esset gloria, seu alterius, dummodò quod esset è reipublicæ literariæ bono prodiret in lucem. Existimavit autem, thesaurum incomparabilem contineri in illis, præsertim rerum Græcarum epochis, quæ non modò historicum, sed fabulosum etiam tempus summè illustrant, conciliántque ; dum memorabilia omnia, ab annis usque octingentis ante Olympiadas, ad usque quingentos quinquaginta post earum initium, describunt\*.”

“ About this time [sometime in the year 1629] Pieresc received the learned Selden’s valuable commentary on the Arundel Marbles, or certain stones, with Greek inscriptions engraved upon them, which had been conveyed out of Asia into England, by the direction of the illustrious earl of Arundel, and placed in his gardens. These marbles, I must observe, were first discovered, and dug out of the ground, in consequence of the application and order of Peiresc, who paid fifty pieces of gold † for that purpose, by the hands of one Samson, his agent at Smyrna. But when they were ready to be sent on board, by some artifice of the vendors, Samson was thrown into prison, and the marbles, in the mean time, left in a state of confusion. I must likewise add, that Peiresc was extremely pleased, when he was informed, that these celebrated reliques of antiquity had fallen into the hands of such an eminent personage, as lord Arundel ; and more particularly, when he found, that they had been happily illustrated by his old friend Selden.

\* Gassend. de Vitâ Peirescii, lib. iv. an. 1629.

† It is perhaps not easy to ascertain the value of the *aurei quinquaginta*.

“As a citizen of the world, whose only view was the benefit of mankind, Peireſc thought it immaterial, whether he himſelf, or another, received the glory, provided any thing could be brought to light, which might contribute to the advantage of the republic of letters. He was of opinion, that an incomparable treasure is contained in theſe Grecian epochas, which not only give a clear and conſiſtent account of the dates of ſome important tranſactions, in the hiſtoric times, but of others alſo, in the fabulous and heroic ages; while they deſcribe every memorable occurrence for 800 years before the Olympiads, and for 550 \* after their commencement.”

Several circumſtances in this narrative are worthy of obſervation.

1. There is ſomething very ſingular and unuſual in the conduct of Peireſc, on the loſs of this inſcription, after he had purchaſed it for a conſiderable ſum. His agent, it ſeems, was committed to priſon, and the marbles were *diftraéta*, broken, ſeparated, and thrown about in confuſion.

It would have been natural for an ordinary virtuoso, who had received information of ſuch a CURIOSITY, to have exerted all his activity and intereſt, in order to procure it. But Peireſc, a rich and indefatigable collector †, a philoſopher, and an eminent patron of learning,

\* The calculation of Gaſſendus in this place is erroneous. The epocha of Cecrops is beſ. Chr. 1582. The Olympiads commenced an. 776, 806 years afterwards. The laſt remaining epocha on the marbles is 354; the date of the inſcription 264. If we bring down our reckoning to the latter, the number of years after the Olympiads is 512; if to the former, it is only 422, inſtead of 550, as Gaſſendus has computed.

† M. Goguet, having occaſion to mention M. de Peireſc, ſays, “Nothing eſcaped him, that could any way contribute to the advancement

ing, does not, as far as we can perceive, make the least effort to recover this inscription ; notwithstanding it was apparently of much greater value, than any other marble monument in the universe. On the contrary, he loses the money he had advanced, chearfully resigns his claim, and is glad to find the marbles were preserved in a foreign country.

His compofure, on this occasion, would lead us to imagine, that he entertained some SECRET fufpicion, relative to the authenticity of the infcription.

2. Peirefc, we are told, paid for thefe marbles *aureos quinquaginta*, “fifty pieces of gold.” What lord Arundel paid for them we are not informed. Prideaux tells us, they were redeemed by Mr. Petty, *majori pretio*\*, “at a greater price;” and Dr. Chandler fays, *pretio LONGE majori* †, “for a far greater fum.”

Suppofing then, that Mr. Petty paid only thrice as much, as Peirefc had paid before, the owners or the venders received 200 pieces for the marbles. This, I apprehend, was an extraordinary acquifition, amply fufficient for the gratification of the author and the ftone-cutter, efpecially at Smyrna, in the earlier part of the laft century. It was certainly as powerful a motive, in conjunction with others, which we do not know, as thofe which actuated either Annius of Viterbo, or any of his brethren, in the fabrication of infcriptions.

3. The fum, which was paid for thefe marbles, was much greater, than what a writer at Paros, 264 years before the birth of Chrift, could poffibly expect; and affords, as far as profit alone is concerned, a fufficient

vancement of human knowledge; and he fpared no pains for that purpofe. Goguet’s Orig. of Laws, vol. iii. Differt. 1. p. 251. Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 5. § 7. p. 397.

\* Prid. Marm. Oxon. pref. p. ix.

† Chand. Marm. Oxon. p. ii.

answer



answer to the question, What advantage could any man propose, by the fabrication of the inscription, adequate to the trouble and expence, attending the execution of this project?

4. It is certain, that Peiresc was never in Asia; that he trusted to the integrity of his agent at Smyrna; and consequently was very liable to be imposed on in this negotiation. On the one side or the other, there was evidently some craft or imposition. Who Samson was, we are not informed: probably he was a Jew. He was however thrown into prison. This gives us no favourable opinion of his integrity. Gassendus indeed says, he was confined, *venditorum arte*, “by the iniquitous contrivance of the venders.” If Samson was guilty of no fraud, the people, who sold the marbles, seem to have been capable of executing any scheme, which might gratify their avarice. For after they had received a considerable sum from Peiresc, they imprisoned his agent, and sold them a second time to Mr. Petty.

Such were the first OSTENSIBLE POSSESSORS of these marbles! and so dark and unsatisfactory is the account, which is transmitted to us of their discovery! They had been totally unknown, or unnoticed for almost nineteen hundred years, and, at last, they are dug out of the ground—no body can tell us WHEN or WHERE!

It will probably be objected, that the mutilated state of the marbles, when they were first brought to England, and examined by Selden, is a proof of their authenticity, as it cannot be supposed, that any man, in his senses, would deface his own inscription.

In answer to this objection we may observe, that the Chronicle may be a modern compilation, and yet not have come immediately from the hands of the original



fabricator. It might have been ACCIDENTALLY defaced, before it was purchased for M. Peiresc.

We are informed, that after Samson was imprisoned, the marbles were broken, separated, and thrown about promiscuously at Smyrna. This will sufficiently account for their mutilation.

But, secondly, some occasional lacunæ might have been artfully contrived, to conceal false assertions and chronological errors ; and, at the same time, to give the marbles a venerable air of antiquity, which was not sufficiently conspicuous in the Greek characters. This artifice has been frequently practised. We shall see a remarkable instance of it in the XVI chapter, where this account is given of one H. Cajadus : “ *Lapides, datâ operâ detruncatos, ut aliqua inessent ANTIQUITATIS VESTIGIA, obrui præcepit.*”

It is well known, that a true antiquary values a fragment, as much as a perfect piece ; and his gusto is perhaps more stimulated by the idea of what is lost, than gratified by the part, which is preserved.

The story of the Sibyl, who appeared to Tarquin, the last king of Rome, is not inapplicable on this occasion.

A woman in strange attire came to Tarquin, and offered to sell him a collection of prophecies in nine volumes, for three hundred pieces of gold \*. Upon his refusing to buy them on these extraordinary terms, the woman threw three of them into the fire, and asked the same price for the remaining six. Tarquin, looking upon her as a mad woman, treated her with contempt. Upon which she burnt three volumes more, and still

\* We are told by Varro, and by Lactantius, who relates the story after him, and likewise by Servius, that the woman demanded three hundred philippi. This anticipation is a little absurd : such a coin did not exist, till the time of king Philip, the father of Alexander the Great.

persisted in demanding as much for these three, as she had done for the whole collection.

The old woman formed a proper notion of human nature. Tarquin's *CURIOSITY* was immediately excited; and the fragments were purchased at the price she demanded \*.

\* A. Gell. l. i. 19. Dion. Halic. l. iv. c. 8. p. 259. Plin. l. xiii. 13. Serv. *Æn.* vi. 72. Varro and Lactantius report the story of Tarquinius Priscus. *Fragm.* p. 35. *Laët.* l. i. c. 6.

## C H A P. XV.

IX. **T**HE world has been often imposed upon by spurious books and inscriptions.

Bishop Stillingfleet, having occasion to question the authenticity of a book, entitled, *Scotorum Antiquitates*, ascribed by Hector Boethius to one Veremundus, a Spaniard \*, makes the following remarks, which are applicable to the present subject.

“ It is well known, that it was no unusual thing in that age [about the beginning of the sixteenth century] to publish books under the names of ancient authors . . . For, about that time, men began to be inquisitive into matters of antiquity; and therefore some, who had more learning, and better inventions than others, set themselves to work, to gratify the curiosity of those, who longed to see something of the antiquities of their own country. And such things were so eagerly and implicitly received by less judicious persons, that it proved no easy matter to convince them of the imposture †.”

The celebrated Dr. Bentley makes the following observations to the same effect.

“ To forge and counterfeit books, and father them upon great names, has been a practice almost as old as letters. But it was then most of all in fashion, when

\* Veremundus is said to have lived about the year 1090. Fabric. Bibl. Med. & Inf. Lat. Hector Boethius flourished in 1526. Gesner. Or, in 1510. König. Bibl.

† Stillingfleet, Orig. Brit. pref. p. 50.

the kings of Pergamus and Alexandria \*, rivaling one another in the magnificence and copiousness of their libraries, gave great rates for any treatises, that carried the names of celebrated authors; which was an invitation to the scribes and copiers of those times, to enhance the price of their wares, by ascribing them to men of fame and reputation; and to suppress the true names, that would have yielded less money. And now and then even an author, who wrote for bread, and made a traffic of his labours, would purposely conceal himself, and personate some old writer of eminent note; giving the title and credit of his works to the dead, that he himself might the better live by them. But what was then done chiefly for lucre, was afterwards done out of glory and affectation, as an exercise of style, and an ostentation of wit. In this the tribe of the sophists are principally concerned; in whose schools it was the ordinary task to compose *Ἱστορίαι* †, to make speeches, and write letters in the name and character of some hero, or great commander, or philosopher: *Τίνας αὖ εἶποι λόγους*, “What would Achilles, Medea, or Alexander, say in such or such circumstances?” Thus Ovid, we see, who was bred up in that way, wrote love-letters in the names of Penelope, and the rest. It is true, they came abroad under his own name; because they were written in Latin and in verse, and so had no colour or pretence to be the originals of the Grecian ladies. But some of the Greek sophists had the success

\* Galen. in Hippoc. de Naturâ Hominis, com. ii. p. 17. edit. Basil.

† Allocutio, quæ à Grecis *Ἱστορίαι* dicitur, est imitatio sermonis ad mores et suppositas personas accommodata: ut, quibus verbis uti potuisset Andromache, Hectore mortuo. Priscian. See the *Ethopœiæ* of Severus the sophist, at the end of the *Rhetores Selecti*, published by Gale.



and satisfaction to see their essays, in that kind, pass with some readers for the genuine works of those, they endeavoured to express. This, no doubt, was great content and joy to them; being as full a testimony of their skill in imitation, as the birds gave to the painter, when they pecked at his grapes. One of them \* indeed has dealt ingenuously, and confessed, that he feigned the answers to Brutus, only as a trial of skill; but most of them took the other way, and concealing their own names, put off their copies for originals; preferring that silent pride and fraudulent pleasure, though it was to die with them, before an honest commendation from posterity for being good imitators. And to speak freely, the greatest part of mankind are so easily imposed on in this way, that there is too great an invitation to put the trick upon them †.”

If we were to take a general view of the republic of letters, we should be astonished at the number of supposititious books, which have been imposed upon the world by knaves and cheats.

Jamblicus, on the testimony of Seleucus, informs us, that Hermes Trismegistus was the author of 20,000 books; and, on the authority of Manetho, 36,525 ‡.

\* Mithridates.—The publication, to which Dr. Bentley alludes, consists of 35 epistles, supposed to have been written by M. Brutus; and the same number of answers, with a preface, by Mithridates, to king Mithridates his cousin.—*Epistolæ, quas nobis reliquit nescio quis, Bruti nomine, nomine Phalaridis, nomine Senecæ et Pauli, quid aliud censerî possunt, quàm DECLAMATIUNCULÆ?* Erasmi. Ep. l. i. r. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. ii. c. 10. vol. i. p. 414.

† Bent. Dissert. upon Phal. p. 6. edit. 1777.

‡ Jamb. de Myst. sect. viii. c. 1.—Julius Firmicus also ascribes 20,000 volumes to Hermes. Mercurius Ægyptius conscripserat viginti millia voluminum de variis substantiis & principiis, & postellatum ordinibus cœlestium. Mathes. l. ii.

There

There are many volumes now extant under his name ; but not one of them is genuine. Two of the most considerable, the *Poëmander*, and the dialogue entitled *Asclepius*, are metaphysical rhapsodies, containing a medley of Christian, Platonic, and Egyptian doctrines, without either taste or consistency ; and appear to have been written since the commencement of Christianity \*.

Twenty or thirty thousand books, produced by one author ! The very idea shocks all human credibility ; and, if ever such a number really existed, under the name of *Hermes*, we may fairly conclude, that the greatest part of them were forgeries †.

The two books of Egyptian hieroglyphics, which are ascribed to *Horus Apollo*, or *Horapollo*, and said to have been translated out of the Egyptian language into Greek by one *Philippus*, are the spurious production of some Greek sophist.

An epic poem, called the *Argonautics*, eighty-six

\* Casaubon calls the *Poëmander*, *semichristiani merum figmentum*, and gives sufficient reasons for his opinion. Exercit. in Baron. Annal. num. 18. p. 55. Stillingfl. Orig. Sacræ, b. ii. c. 2. *Asclepius* is in the same style, and seems to be a production of the same brain.

† Patricius assigns some very probable reasons for the ascription of all these books to *Hermes*.—*Quòd fuerit*, says he, in more antiquissimorum hominum, ut si cui libro authoritatem accedere cuperent, vel Dei alicujus, ut *Ægyptii Mercurii*, vel hominis alicujus insignis, nomine ornarent, reverentiâ scilicet quâdam ; vel etiam quòd vendibiliorem eo nomine sperarent fore ; vel quòd fœtui proprio, alieni nominis quàm sui insignibus, gratiam majorem consequi sperarent ac immortalitatem ; vel postremò, quòd reverà author libri ignoraretur, viderenturque in eo contenta dogmata non nisi magni viri esse ; aut etiam negligentia quadam, ac nullâ librorum expensione, alicujus eos viri celeberrimi nomine insigniverunt. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3. p. 29. Vid. Galen. de Simpl. Medic. Facul. l. vi.

hymns, and other pieces, pass under the name of Orpheus, the celebrated Thracian, who lived at the time of the Argonautic expedition \*. But they are evidently supposititious. As the ancients have told us, that Orpheus could make wild beasts, trees, rocks, and rivers listen to his music, it is no wonder, that certain poets in later ages assumed his character, and sent their productions into the world under his auspices. His name was an incomparable passport and recommendation to the writings of obscure bards. Aristotle asserted, that no such poet as Orpheus ever existed: “*Orpheum poetam docet Aristoteles nunquam fuisse †.*” Cicero seems to agree with Aristotle; and Vossius, Huetius, and others, maintain the same opinion ‡.

But, without calling his existence in question, we may be fully assured, that none of his works are now remaining.

\* Suidas says, a little extravagantly, that Orpheus lived “eleven generations before the Trojan war.” But who shall pretend to ascertain the age of a poet, who is said to have been the son of Apollo and Calliope, and to have gone down to the regions of Pluto to fetch his wife? Saxius places him 1255 years bef. Christ.

† Cic. de Nat. Deor. l. i. § 107.

‡ Puto enim, triumviros istos poëtas, Orphea, Musæum, Linum, non fuisse; sed esse nomina ab antiquâ Phœnicum linguâ, quâ usi Cadmus et aliquamdiu posteri. Voss. de Art. Poet. c. 13. p. 78. Huet. Dem. Evang. prop. iv. c. 8. § 19. p. 184. edit. 1680.—Vid. Suid. in v. *ὅθεν*, “where,” says Dr. Bentley, “there is an account of half a score of such counterfeit writers.” Dissert. on Phal. p. 10. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. viii. c. 6. Diog. Laert. in procem. § 5. Pliny places Orpheus in the list of magicians. Nat. Hist. l. xxx. c. 1.

Some writers pretend, that the Argonautics, the hymns, and other poetical pieces, which are extant under the name of Orpheus, are the works of Onomacritus, who lived about 520 years before the Christian æra.—This notion may be as groundless, as the other.



Musæus is said to have been the son, or the disciple of Orpheus \*. The poem of Hero and Leander, which is published under his name, is probably the work of some Greek poet in the fifth or sixth century †. It is observed, that he has borrowed very largely from the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus ‡. We often meet with the name of Musæus; but never find the least intimation of this poem, in any ancient writer. Tzetzes, I believe, is the first, who expressly mentions it ||. It was first printed in 1486.

We have a history, *De Excidio Trojæ*, of the Destruction of Troy, under the name of Dares Phrygius. In an epistle prefixed, it is pretended, that this Dares was present at the siege; that his manuscript was discovered at Athens many years afterwards, by C. Nepos, and translated by him into Latin.

\* Diod. Sic. l. iv. p. 232. Suidas.

† Musæum hunc recentiorem circumcirca tempora Coluthi, Tryphiodori, Joannis Gazæi, Nonni, Christodori, Leonis Magistri, multis scilicet post Christum natum annis, floruisse certissimum est, præter orationis structuram, ipso operis titulo, ubi se grammaticum appellat, Μουσίου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ τὰ κατ' Ἡρώ καὶ Λεάνδρου; et istiusmodi inscriptionem in pluribus me legisse memini manuscriptis codicibus. Allat. de Patriâ Homeri, c. 4. p. 75.

.. An quæso, nisi monitus criticorum vaticiniis, Musæo, Orpheo, Lino, Phocylidi, et aliis INNUMERIS, tum Pelasgis, tum Romanis, poemata spuria multa, et illegitima, assignata fuisse, hodièque assignari INSULSE, ut veteri Phocylidi quæ supersunt, Musæo de Herone et Leandro poema, scire quis unquam potuisset? Mauffaci Dissert. Crit. de Harpocratore, p. 399. edit. 1683.

. If we may depend on the authority of Josephus and Sextus Empiricus, there were no writings remaining, in their days, among the Greeks, of higher antiquity, than the poems of Homer. See notes to chap. ix. p. 127.

[ Paræus in Musæum.

|| Tzet. Chil. ii. hist. 38. v. 435.—Tzetzes flourished about the year 1176.



But the inelegant, not to say, the despicable style, in which it is written, as well as many other circumstances, clearly demonstrate the falsity of these pretences.

There is another production of the same character, in six books, *De Bello Trojano*, of the Trojan War, bearing the name of *Dictys Cretensis*. In the preface, and an epistle, which accompanies this work, it is asserted, that the author attended Idomeneus to the siege of Troy, and wrote the history of that expedition in the Greek language, but in Phœnician characters; that his work was buried with him at his own request, in a coffer made of pewter or tin; that, in consequence of an earthquake, the coffer was discovered, in the reign of Nero; and some time afterwards translated into Latin, by one *Q. Septimius Romanus*.

This legendary tale, and some others, which I shall have occasion to mention, are evidently formed upon the old story of king Numa \*, who is said to have ordered, that his books should be safely enclosed in a stone chest, and buried by his side. After they had lain in the ground 490 years †, they were, it seems, accidentally discovered, and appeared as fresh, as if they had been newly written ‡! Some people imagined, they were kept in this EXCELLENT PRESERVATION by a miracle ||. Others probably, a little more sagacious than the rest, upon observing the Egyptian papyrus, of which

\* Varro *Fragm.* p. 51. Liv. l. xl. c. 29. Plin. l. xiii. c. 13. Plut. v. Numæ, p. 74. Val. Max. l. i. c. i. § 12. Lactan. l. i. c. 22. Aur. Viêt. c. 3.

† Numa died, bef. Chr. 671; and his books were found in the year 181. Corfin. Plin. loc. cit.

‡ Non integros modò, sed recentissimâ specie. Liv. loc. cit.

|| Majore miraculo, quòd tot infossi duraverint annis. Plin. loc. cit.

they were made, the freshness of the writing, and the contents, looked upon them as forgeries. It is however agreed on all hands, that Q. Petilius, the prætor, by a decree of the senate, caused them to be publicly burnt; which certainly would not have been suffered, if there had been any reason to believe, they were the genuine remains of the religious Numa \*.

A small volume, containing 148 epistles, has been repeatedly published under the name and character of Phalaris, tyrant of Agrigentum. In the year 1695, the Hon. Mr. Boyle printed a new edition of these Epistles, which occasioned a memorable controversy between him and Dr. Bentley. The latter, in a Dissertation †, well known to the learned, considers the chronology, the language, the contents, and the first appearance of these epistles; and incontestably proves, that they are the spurious productions of some sophist, who lived in a much later age, than the real Phalaris. To this Dissertation, the learned author has subjoined some critical remarks on the Epistles of Themistocles ‡, Socrates, and Euripides; and on Æsop's Fables, shewing, that they are likewise supposititious.

\* *Incluta justitia religiôque Numæ Pompilii erant.* Liv. l. i. c. 18.

† Bentley's Dissertation was printed at the end of the second edition of Mr. Wotton's *Reflections on ancient and modern Learning*, in 1697. The Examination of Bentley's Dissertation, by the Hon. Mr. Boyle, appeared about nine months afterwards; and a second edition of it, before the end of the year 1698. This drew from Dr. Bentley another edition of his Dissertation, in 1699, with a preface, and very large additions, in answer to the examiner.

‡ The very judicious and accurate Corini deduces a new argument against the authenticity of the epistles, ascribed to Themistocles, from a mistake, which the author has made in the thirteenth epistle, concerning the Corinthian month Panemus. *Fast. Antiq. Dissert. iii. § 22.*

Some

Some of the dialogues, which are published among the works of Plato, were written by other authors. Erasmus thinks, this is so very evident, that he, who does not perceive it, must have no discernment\*.

Diogenes Laertius observes, that the dialogues, entitled, Eryxias, Acephalus or Sisyphus, Axiochus, and Demodocus, are undoubtedly spurious †. The Definitions, the Dialogue on Virtue, and that on Justice, are generally placed in the same class ‡. The Epinomis has been ascribed to Philippus Opuntius, one of Plato's disciples ||; the second Alcibiades to Xenophon §, and Phædon to Panætius ¶.

\* Sunt aliquot inter Platonicos dialogos, quos nemo non sentit supposititios esse, nisi qui nihil omninò sentit animo. Erasmi Epist. ad tom. iv. Hieron. Op. p. 5.

† Diog. Laert. l. iii. c. 62.

Eryxias is ascribed to Æschines, the Socratic philosopher. Suidas in v. *Αἰσχίνης*.

Sisyphus or Acephalus, to Æschines. Diog. Laert. l. ii. § 60. iii. § 62. Suid. loc. cit.

Axiochus to Æschines. Diog. Laert. Harpoc. in v. *Αἰσχίνης*. Suidas loc. cit. et in v. *Αἰσχίνης*.

Demodocus : εἰ δὲ τοῦ Πλάτωνος τὸ συγγραμμα, si modò est opus Platonis. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. i. p. 315.

‡ The *ὁρίαι*, or Definitions, are supposed to have been written by Speusippus. Diog. Laert. l. iv. § 5. Lambecii Comment. de Biblioth. Cæsar. l. vii. p. 137.

The Dialogue on Virtue is placed by Suidas among the works of Æschines.

|| Diog. Laert. l. iii. § 37.

§ Athen. l. xi. p. 506.

¶ Menagii Observ. in Diog. Laert. l. iii. § 62. Vid. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vol. ii. p. 9. Placcii Theatrum Pseudonymorum. p. 511. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3.

\* \* In what relates to the want of authenticity, in some of Plato's Dialogues, and the works of others, I give the sentiments of learned writers, without any design to adopt or maintain their opinions, when they are not confirmed by unquestionable evidence.

Laertius



Laertius reckons up "near 400 books," which, he says, were undoubtedly written by Aristotle \*. Patricius has collected the titles of 747, which have been ascribed to that philosopher †. But many of these pieces, as he has sufficiently proved, are supposititious. Galen and Ammonius give us an anecdote, which accounts for this inundation of spurious publications, under the name of Aristotle.

"When the Attali and the Ptolemies," says Galen, "were rivaling one another in forming and enriching their respective libraries, the knavery of forging books and titles began [to be a common practice.] For, in order to get money, many artful schemers prefixed the names of celebrated authors to their manuscripts, and, under such fictitious characters, sold them to those princes ‡."

Ammonius relates the same story. "It is reported," says he, "that Ptolemy Philadelphus, being desirous of collecting the works of Aristotle, as indeed he was of collecting all sorts of books, gave rewards to those, who brought him any treatise of that philosopher. Some therefore, with a design to make an advantage of his liberality, affixed the name of Aristotle to the compositions of other authors ||."

On

\* Ἄ τον αριθμον εγγυς ἔκει τετρακοσίων, quæ ad quadringentorum numerum ferè perveniunt. Diog. Laert. l. v. § 34.

† Si hi, ex variis authoribus, atque ipso Aristotele, collecti, libri triginta septem, reliquis à Laertio enumeratis, atque iis, qui extant, addantur, septingentorum quadraginta septem numerum adimplebunt. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. l. ii. p. 18.—The same books were probably mentioned by different authors, under different titles. This circumstance seems to have deceived many writers, who have enumerated the works of the ancients.

‡ Galen. in Hippoc. de Nat. Hom. com. ii. p. 17.

|| Πτολεμαίων τον Φιλαδέλφον πᾶν σπουδακῶς ἐποιεῖτο ἀριστοτελεῖ  
εὐγγεμῶς,



## 192 A DISSERTATION ON

On this account, it is almost impossible for us to know, which are the genuine productions of Aristotle.

The treatise on Elocution, usually ascribed to Demetrius Phalereus, though not unworthy of his character, is most probably the work of some other Demetrius, or some rhetorician of a later age, who has assumed his name\*.

A hundred and thirty comedies were circulated at Rome, under the name of Plautus; but we are assured,

συγγράμματα, ὡς καὶ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, καὶ χρήματα δίδοναι τοῖς προσφεροσιν αὐτῷ βιβλους τοῦ φιλοσοφοῦ· ὅθεν τινες χρηματίζεσθαι βουλευμένοι, ἐπιγράφοντες συγγράμματα τῷ τοῦ φιλοσοφοῦ ὀνόματι, προσήγον. Aiant Ptolemæum Philadelphum incensum studio fuisse circa Aristotelis libros, sicuti et circa alios, et munera dedisse iis, qui sibi adferrent libros philosophi. Quare quidam ditari inde volentes, inscripserunt libros nomine philosophi, eique detulerunt. Ammon. Com. in Arist. Categ. p. 10.

\* The scholiast on the Nubes of Aristophanes, quoting a passage in the treatise on Elocution, says, ὡς ἐφη Διονυσίος ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεύς ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἑρμηνείας: For this and other reasons, Valesius ascribes the treatise on Elocution to Dionysius Halicarnassæus. Valesii Excerpta, p. 65. Menagii Observ. in Diog. Laert. l. v. § 81. Hæd. de Bibl. Text. l. i. c. 9. p. 55.

Vossius, Gale, &c. ascribe it to some other Demetrius. Auctor videtur alius Demetrius, rhetor Alexandrinus. Voss. Instit. Orat. l. vi. c. 2.—Tandem in sententiam Vossianam transivi. Gale præf. ad Rhet. Select.—Propendet animus ut credam, Demetrium Alexandrinum aureoli hujus libelli auctorem esse. Hudson. præf. ad Dionys. Halic.—Demetrii alicujus rhetoris libellus. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. l. iv. c. 31. § 1. vol. iv. p. 424.—Demetrius was a very common name. Diogenes Laertius mentions twenty, and Fabricius above a hundred Demetrii. Bibl. Græc. vol. x. p. 390.

The editor of Daniel secundum LXX. contends, that the treatise on Elocution is really the work of the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus. Dilert. iv. § 15.

that

that Varro, an excellent judge in this case, included only twenty-one in the list of that author's works\*.

Among the various pieces, which have been falsely ascribed to Cicero, the CONSOLATIO is the most remarkable. This tract made its first appearance in the year 1583, and is generally supposed to have been the work of Sigonius. "The essay de Consolatione," says Dr. Bentley, "as coming from a skilful hand, may perhaps pass for Cicero's with some, as long as Cicero himself shall last †." There is however an obvious and striking circumstance attending it, which alone seems to destroy all its pretensions to authenticity; and that is, the passages quoted by Lactantius ‡ from Cicero's real work, do not exist in the present Consolatio.

In the second century, we find the practice of forging books so very common, and so eagerly pursued, that it was impossible to guard against literary impositions ||. We have a memorable instance of those fraudulent schemes in the case of Galen. That eminent physician having been the author of many volumes, not only on medical subjects, but on philosophy, grammar, and rhetoric §, lest his reputation should be injured by spurious publications, gave the world a particular account of his

\* A. Gell. l. iii. c. 3.

† Bentley, Dissert. on Phal. p. 8.—See the opinions of several writers on this subject collected by Placcius, in his Theatrum Pseudonymorum, num. 646. p. 179—181.

‡ Lactan. l. iii. c. 14. 18. Vid. Lipsii Opera, tom. i. edit. Moreti, p. 411. Clerici Art. Crit. tom. ii. p. 333.

|| Nemini non notum, quàm fertile et fecundum scriptorum fictitiorum fuerit seculum secundum à Christo nato. Nihil magis tunc temporis in usu fuit, quàm libros emittere sub nominibus antiquiorum. Quod infinitis exemplis luculentò constat. Hodiùs, de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. i. c. 9. p. 53.

§ Suidas in v. Γαληνός.

writings \*. Yet, notwithstanding this precaution, above forty books were fathered upon him, which are not included in his catalogue †.

In this manner a multitude of spurious productions have been published under the names of Homer, Æsop, Euripides, Hippocrates, Aristophanes, Lysias ‡, Demosthenes, Plutarch, Lucian, Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, Quintilian, and almost every other eminent author of Greece and Rome ||.

The forgeries of Annii Viterbiensis are well known. In the year 1497, this impudent monk published a volume, containing, as he pretended, the Antiquities of Berofus in five books; one book of Manetho's Supplement to Berofus; one book of Xenophon's *Æquivoca*; two books of Fabius Pictor on the Golden Age, and the Origin of Rome; one book of Myrsilus Lesbios on the Pelasgic War; one book of Cato's *Origines*; one book of an Itinerary by Antoninus Pius; one book of C. Sempronius, on the Division of Italy; a chronological tract by Archilochus; one book of Megasthenes § on the Assyrian and Persian Annals; an

\* *Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων*, Of his own books.

† Galeno, quanquam de libris suis librum edidisset, quo testatum relinqueret, quinam à se conscripti libri essent, sunt tamen reperti homines audaculi, qui illi, præter à se nominatos ascripserunt libros plusquam quadraginta. Patric. Discuss. Peripat. tom. i. l. 3. p. 29.

‡ Harpocration, in his excellent Lexicon on the Ten Orators of Greece, when he mentions any oration of Lysias, or of others, the authenticity of which is not sufficiently ascertained, usually subjoins the words, *εἰ γνησιος*, "if it be genuine." And this useful caution he repeats, on many occasions, in the course of his references. v. p. 41. 13. 16. 17. 22, 23. & alibi passim.

|| Vid. Erasmi Epist. ad tom. iv. Hieron. Op. p. 5. Placcii Theatrum Pseudonymorum.

§ Ita eum ineptè vocat, qui est Megasthenes. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. iii. c. 8. p. 609.

Epitome



Epitome of History by Philo in one book ; a tract of Marius Aretius on the Situation of Sicily ; and a Dialogue, containing a description of Spain, by the same author \*.

These fragments were illustrated by the comments of Annius himself ; and for some years passed for the genuine works of the authors, whose names they bear. They are now universally exploded, as the fictions of the editor.

The learned Dr. Prideaux, having occasion to mention the forgeries of Annius, the British History of Geoffrey of Monmouth †, and other productions of the same stamp, subjoins this reflection : “ All these are no other than the fictions of the first editors. They framed them to perpetuate their names by the publication ; and they have truly done so, for they are still remembered for it ; but no otherwise, than under the style of INFAMOUS IMPOSTORS ‡.”

It is remarkable, that no province of literature has been so grievously infested with cheats and forgers,

\* Berosi, sacerdotis Chaldaici antiquitatum libri quinque, &c. Romæ, 1497. folio. This collection was afterwards printed at Venice, Paris, Basil, Antwerp, and other places.

† Geoffrey of Monmouth lived in the time of Henry the First and Stephen, and was bishop of St. Asaph in 1152. In his British History he affirms, that Brutus, the great-grandson of Æneas, and after him above seventy glorious monarchs, reigned in this island, during a period of 1053 years, before the invasion of Julius Cæsar. He continues his narrative to the death of Cadwallader, in the year 689.

This history contains the story of king Lear and his daughters ; an account of the wonderful exploits of Uther Pendragon, and king Arthur ; the prophecies of Merlin, and many similar curiosities. See above, chap. iii.

‡ Prid. Connect. vol. ii. p. 804.



as that of Jewish and ecclesiastical antiquity\*. Here we read of the BOOKS of Abel, Seth, Enoch, Shem, Abraham, and Og the giant; the TESTAMENTS of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Job, Moses, Solomon, and the twelve patriarchs; the LITURGIES of Matthew, Mark, John, James, Peter, the Virgin Mary, and Jesus Christ; the ACTS of Andrew, John, Mark, Matthias, Paul, Peter, Philip, Thomas, Pilate, Caiaphas, and Thecla; the EPISTLES of Luke to Galen, Peter to James, John to a man who had the dropsy, Paul to the Laodiceans, and the Virgin Mary to Ignatius; the GOSPELS of James, Andrew, Thomas, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthias, Barnabas, Thaddæus, Peter, Paul, Nicodemus, Judas Iscariot, and Eve; the REVELATIONS of Peter, Stephen, Paul, Thomas, Solomon, Moses, Job, Elias, Abraham, Noah, Adam; the MAGICAL WRITINGS of Solomon, Joseph, Abraham, Ham, and Noah †.

To this list we may add the following extract from a decree of pope Gelasius I. made in the year 494, *De Libris apocryphis, &c.*

*Itinerarium nomine Petri apostoli, quod appellatur S. Clementis, libri viii. apocryphum.*  
*Actus nomine Andreæ apostoli, apoc.*  
*Actus nomine Philippi apostoli, apoc.*  
*Actus nomine Petri apostoli, apoc.*

\* Illud me vehementer movet, quod videam primis ecclesiæ temporibus quamplurimos extitisse, qui facinus palmarium judicabant, coelestem veritatem figmentis suis ire adjutum; quo facilius videlicet nova doctrina à gentium sapientibus admitteretur. Officiosa hæc mendacia vocabant, bono fine excogitata. Quo ex forte dubio procul sunt orti LIBRI SEXCENTI, quos illa ætas & proxima viderunt. Casaub. in Baron. Annales Exercit. i. num. 18. p. 54.

† Fabric. Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test. Cod. Apoc. Nov. Test. passim.

Actus

- Actus nomine Thomæ apostoli, apoc.  
 Evangelium nomine Thaddæi, apoc.  
 Evangelium nomine Thomæ apostoli, quo utuntur  
 Manichæi, apoc.  
 Evangelium nomine Barnabæ, apoc.  
 Evangelium nomine Bartholomæi apostoli, apoc.  
 Evangelium nomine Andreæ apostoli, apoc.  
 Evangelia, quæ falsavit Lucianus, apoc.  
 Evangelia, quæ falsavit Hesychius, apoc.  
 Liber de Infantiâ Salvatoris, apoc.  
 Liber de Nativitate Salvatoris, et de S. Mariâ, et de  
 obstetrice Salvatoris, apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur Pastoris, apoc.  
 Libri omnes, quos fecit Lenticius, discipulus diaboli,  
 apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur de filiabus Adæ, vel Genesis,  
 apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur Actus Theclæ & Pauli apostoli,  
 apoc.  
 Revelatio, quæ appellatur Thomæ apostoli, apoc.  
 Revelatio, quæ appellatur Pauli apostoli, apoc.  
 Revelatio, quæ appellatur Stephani, apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur Transitus S. Mariæ, apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur Pœnitentia Adæ, apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur Diogenes, nomine gigantis, qui  
 post diluvium cum dracone pugnasse perhibetur,  
 apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur Testamentum Job, apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur Sortes apostolorum, apoc.  
 Liber, qui appellatur Laus apostolorum, apoc.  
 Liber Canonum apostolorum, apoc.  
 Epistola Jesu ad Abgarum regem, apocrypha, &c. \*

\* Fabric. Cod. Apoc. p. 65. 135. Varrerii Censura, p. 14. &c.

The decree, from which this catalogue is taken, is supposed by Dr. Cave \*, and some other ecclesiastical writers, to be supposititious. But the learned Casaubon speaks of it in much more favourable terms. For having mentioned the gospel according to the Egyptians, the prophecy of Ham, the apocalypse of Moses, and other notorious forgeries, he calls it, “*insigniter salutare decretum*,” a very salutary decree, in which, he says, many books of this despicable sort are specified and condemned †.

However, whether it is genuine or not, it will serve to shew us, what numbers of absurd and scandalous publications were imposed upon the world, in the first ages of Christianity, under the respectable names of apostles and evangelists. *Hanc legem, says Varrerius on a quotation from the same decree, hic duximus subjiciendam, ut melius intelligatur, quantum præpostera hominum ingenia fallacibus hujusmodi et fucosis artibus delectentur ‡.*”—Supposing the decree itself is a forgery, it is but an addition to the impositions already mentioned.

If we descend to the primitive fathers, we shall find a multitude of spurious productions under their names. Cave || enumerates thirty pieces of that kind, which have been ascribed to Cyprian; thirty, which have been attributed to Athanasius; thirty, which have appeared under the name of Jerom; sixty, which have been published as the works of Austin; seventy, which have been fathered on Chrysostom; and so on, in proportion to the reputation of each respective writer.

The number of forgeries, false records, and counter-

\* Cave, Hist. Liter. sub an. 492.

† Casaub. in Baron. Annal. Exercit. i. p. 22. 54.

‡ De Beroso Censura, p. 14.

|| Cave, Hist. Liter.



feit antiquities, imposed upon the world by the advocates of the church of Rome \*, in support of their religion, or, more properly speaking, their SYSTEM of SUPERSTITION, exceeds almost all imagination, and affords a deplorable instance of the depravity of mankind, and the facility, with which knaves and bigots have suppressed every suggestion of conscience, reason, and religion, while they were engaged in the pursuit of what is absurdly, if not ironically, called a PIOUS FRAUD !

If we confine our observations to the present century, and to our own country in particular, we shall meet with several notorious instances of literary craft and imposition.

The late Psalmanazar wrote a fictitious history of Formosa †, and invented a new language, which, he pretended, was the language of that island. The imposition was supported for some time ; and the author was caressed as a prodigy of abstinence, piety, and learning. But in the latter part of his life, his conscience began to upbraid him ; and, in a posthumous publication, he acknowledged, that the account, which he had given of Formosa, and of his travels and conversion from paganism to Christianity, was an infamous fiction ‡.

In

\* See a book, entitled, Roman Forgeries, published in 1673.

† An historical and geographical Description of Formosa, 8vo. 1704.—A second edition of this work was published in 1705, with a preface, containing, “ an answer to every thing, that had been objected against the author and his book.”

Psalmanazar died in 1763, about the eighty-sixth year of his age.

‡ Memoirs of \*\*\*\*, commonly known by the name of George Psalmanazar, a reputed native of Formosa, written by himself, in order to be published after his death, &c. 8vo. 1764.

In his will he says : “ The principal manuscript I thought myself in duty bound to leave behind, is a faithful narrative of my education,



In the year 1747, the literati were surpris'd at the appearance of an Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns, in his *Paradise Lost*, by William Lauder\* ; the tendency of which was to shew, that Milton was a plagiarist. In pursuance of this design, he charged Milton with having borrowed many parts of his plan, many passages, sentiments, and images, from the *Sarcotis* of Masenius, the *Adamus Exul* of Grotius, the *Triumphus Pacis* of Staphorstius, the *Comœdia Apocalyptica* of John Fox, the *Locustæ* of Phineas Fletcher, the *Bellum Angelicum* of Taubman†, and other similar productions.

Some

education, and the fallies of my wretched youthful years, and the various ways, by which I was, in some measure, unavoidably led into the base and shameful imposture, of passing upon the world for a native of Formosa, and a convert to Christianity, and backing it with a fictitious account of that island, and of my own travels, conversion, &c. all or most of it hatched in my own brain, without regard to truth and honesty." p. 5, 6.

\* Lauder commenced his attack upon Milton in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for January 1747 ; and continued his animadversions, at different times, in that publication. An imaginary success prompted him to reprint his extracts and observations, with considerable additions, in a separate volume, 8vo. which appeared in December 1749.

† Jacobus Masenius was professor of rhetoric and poetry, in the Jesuits college at Cologne. His *Sarcotis* consists of five books, and was printed about the year 1654. An elegant edition of this poem, and of some other pieces, by Masenius and Grenan, was published at Paris in 1771, with some observations on Lauder's controversy.

Grotius is said to have written his tragedy, entitled, *Adamus Exul*, when he was only eighteen years of age. It was printed at Leyden in 1601 ; but was not inserted in the collection of his poems.

Caspar Staphorstius was a Dutch poet and divine. His *Triumphus Pacis* was a congratulatory poem, on the conclusion of the

Some of the examples, which he produced, in support of this accusation, bore such a striking resemblance to passages in the *Paradise Lost*, that many of his readers were inclined to applaud his sagacity, and the propriety of his remarks.

But while the enemies of Milton were shouting, *Triumphe !* and insulting the memory of the injured poet, an acute and learned writer rose up in his defence, and effectually exposed this master-piece of fraud and imposition, by demonstrating, that Lauder had inserted several passages of Hog's translation \* of *Paradise Lost*, and other lines of his own composition, into the extracts, which he had produced from Masenius, Staphorstius, and others ; and then urged those very lines as a proof, that Milton had copied them †.

As this charge was unanswerable, Lauder thought proper to throw himself on the candor of the public,

peace between the states of Holland, and the commonwealth of England, in 1655.

John Fox, the martyrologist, published his *Comœdia Apocalyp-tica*, or *Christus Triumphans*, in 1551.

Phineas Fletcher was Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. His poem against the Jesuits, entitled, *Locustæ, vel Pietas Jesuitica*, was printed in 1627.

Taubman, the author of *Bellum Angelicum*, printed about the year 1604, was the celebrated commentator on Plautus and Virgil.

\* *Paraphrasis poetica in tria Johannis Miltoni, V. C. poemata, viz. Paradisum Amisum, Paradisum Recuperatum, et Sarcophagum Agonisten. Autore Gulielmo Hogæo. Londini, 1690.*

† Milton vindicated from the charge of plagiarism, brought against him by Mr. Lauder ; and Lauder himself convicted of several FORGERIES and gross IMPOSITIONS on the public. By John Douglas, M. A. [now bishop of Carlisle.] 8vo. 1751.

A second edition of this pamphlet was published in 1756.

by subscribing a penitential acknowledgment, dictated by a learned friend, of all his interpolations in the writers he had quoted \*.

In the year 1762, an enterprizing writer published an epic poem in six books, entitled *Fingal*, and other pieces, of a singular character, under the name of *Ossian*, which were said to have been translated from the *Galic* or *Erse*. The truth of this assertion has been frequently controverted. It is however strenuously maintained by those, who are advocates for the literary glory of *Caledonia*. But the very existence of *Ossian*, if ever there was such a poet, is, like the history of *Orpheus*, enveloped in fable and romance; and though we may allow the pretended translator to have collected some traditionary stories, some ancient fragments, and some strolling ballads, we may reasonably suspect, that the greatest part of these poems have been composed by the editor, as he has never condescended to favour the world with the works of *Ossian* in their original language, though such a publication has been frequently requested †; and would have not only silenced all ob-

\* This confession was entitled, *A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Douglas*, occasioned by his vindication of *Milton*, &c. By *Wm. Lauder*, A. M. 4to. 1751. It was dictated by the late *Dr. Johnson*, who, at first, had conceived a favourable opinion of *Lauder's* abilities and integrity. *Lauder* however in the year 1754, retracted his confession, defended his essay, and made a new attack upon *Milton*, in a pamphlet, entitled, “*King Charles I. vindicated from the charge of plagiarism, brought against him by Milton; and Milton himself convicted of forgery, and a gross imposition on the public.*—*Lauder* died in *Barbadoes*, about the year 1771.

† *Dr. Johnson* required, that the original should be deposited in either the king's or the marischal college at *Aberdeen*, and submitted to public inspection; but this was never done. *Hawkins's Life of Johnson*, p. 488.



jections, but have been esteemed a valuable curiosity in the republic of letters \*.

About the beginning of the year 1777, the attention of the public was excited by a volume of Poems, which were said to have been written at Bristol by Thomas Rowley, a secular priest of that city, and others, in the fifteenth century †. These pieces were read with surprise and admiration, and occasioned a variety of conjectures, relative to their authenticity. It was asserted, that the original manuscripts had been found in an old chest in Redcliff church, at Bristol, by one Chatterton the sexton; that Chatterton gave them to his nephew, the master of a writing-school in Pile-street ‡; and that, after the death of the latter, they fell into the hands of his son, Thomas Chatterton, who sent some of them to the editors of the magazines, and disposed of others.

Some learned writers have maintained, that they are the genuine productions of Rowley ||; others have supposed, that they were not written by Rowley, but forged by Chatterton §, who probably derived the first idea of such

\* It is said, that Ossian was the son of Fingal, a king of Scotland, celebrated for his prowess; that he lived in the beginning of the fourth century; and that these poems are superior to those of all other Caledonian bards, both in genius and antiquity.

† In the reigns of Henry VI. and Edward IV.

‡ Account of Chatterton by Dean Milles.

|| Their authenticity is asserted in several publications, particularly the following:—"Poems, supposed to have been written at Bristol, by Thomas Rowley, &c. with a Commentary. By Jeremiah Milles, Dean of Exeter, 4to. 1782."

"Observations upon the Poems of Thomas Rowley, in which the authenticity of those poems is ascertained. By Jacob Bryant, Esq. 8vo. 1782."

§ Thomas Chatterton, the hero of this controversy, was born Nov. 20, 1752, and educated at a charity-school in Bristol. At the age of fourteen, he was articled clerk to an attorney in that



such a project from some old parchments, which might have been found, as he asserted, in a chest in Redcliff church.

This opinion seems to be much more probable than the other, for the following reasons.

1. It is hardly to be imagined, that all the poems, ascribed to Rowley, could have lain in a chest, unobserved and unexamined, for the space of 300 years ; and that there should not, during this long interval, have been one, among all the learned vicars of Redcliff church, who had the curiosity to examine, and the sagacity to discover, the contents of this wonderful repository.

2. The phraseology, the splendid descriptions, the poetical images, the harmony of the versification, very unusual with writers of the fifteenth century, the manifest imitation of later poets, some apparent anachronisms, and OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES, are strong presumptive evidences, that they are not the compositions of Rowley.

Chatterton's abilities for a work of this nature can hardly be doubted, if we attend either to his comments on the poems attributed to Rowley, or to many similar pieces, which, we are assured, are his genuine and acknowledged productions \*.

But,

city. In April 1770, he came to London, in hopes of advancing his fortune by his pen ; but he was so miserably disappointed, that about four months afterwards, in a fit of despair, he put an end to his life, at the age of seventeen years and nine months.

\* See Remarks on Chatterton's Miscellanies by the Author of this Dissertation, in the Critical Review for August 1778, where it is shewn, that there have been many EARLY GENIUSES, equal or superior to Chatterton, in the republic of letters.

On this occasion, the present Dissertator, though he owns these insignificant remarks, would wish to intimate, that his concern in  
the

But, not to dwell any longer on supposititious BOOKS, let us proceed to fictitious INSCRIPTIONS.

the same Review extended only from August 1764 to September 1785 inclusive ; and that he is not, at present, accountable for any criticisms, which appear in that publication.

## C H A P. XVI.

**A**BOUT the year 1435, Cyriacus Anconitanus, surnamed the Antiquary, collected inscriptions, and other remains of antiquity, in different parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa \*. He pretended to have found a multitude of inscriptions in Spain, as well as in other countries, which Ambrosius Morales, and other Spanish historians, quoted upon his authority. But the learned and judicious Antonius Augustinus, archbishop of Tarragon, assures us, that many of these inscriptions were fictitious; and that, in his time, none of them were to be seen in Spain †.

In

\* Cyriacus's inscriptions, in three volumes, folio, entitled, *Antiquarum Rerum Commentaria*, were never entirely published. Some of them only were communicated by himself to his friends; about 200 were printed by C. Moronus in 1660, and others have appeared in different collections.

A small volume in 12mo. entitled, *Kyriaci Anconitani Itinerarium*, was published by Laurentius Mehus, at Florence, in 1742, containing eight Letters by Kyriacus, and a preface by the editor, in vindication of the author's literary character. But this publication contains no inscriptions, nor any very important information.

† *Cyriaci Anconitani inscriptiones plurimas in Annalibus Hispanice Ambrosius Morales temerè descripsit. B. Mirari equidem solco in tot tantisque antiquis inscriptionibus, quas ille attulit, nullas hodiè in Hispaniâ legi. A. Illud incommodi est, videri Joannem Annium & Cyriacum, similisque farinæ homines, Hispanos irridere voluisse, confictis Hispanorum rebus gestis sub Noâ, Tubale; serie item contextâ regum falsorum, quasi nostris regnassent temporibus; fictis adhuc lapidibus, de bello cum Viriatho, & Sertorio; civili quoque Cæsaris ac Pompeii, &c. Augustini Antiquitatum Dialogi. xi. p. 161.*

Augustinus's



In 1534, Petrus Apianus and Bartholomæus Amantius published a large collection of antiquities at Ingolstadt, in which they inserted a considerable number of those, which had been either collected or invented by Kyriacus \*. The learned writer I have just now cited affirms, that many of these inscriptions are forged by different authors †.

About the year 1520, Alexander Geraldinus pretended to have found in various parts of Ethiopia, on both sides of the equinoxial line, many Roman inscriptions and antiquities ‡, more valuable (if genuine)

Augustinus's Dialogues were published in the Spanish language in 1587, and translated into Latin by And. Schottus, 1617. The author died in 1588, aged 71 years. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. iii. c. 10. p. 809.

Reinesius speaks favourably of Cyriacus. Inscript. Antiq. præf. p. ii.

\* This collection bears the following title : Inscriptiones sacrosanctæ vetustatis, non illæ quidem Romanæ, sed totius sæculi orbis, summo studio ac maximis impensis terrâ marique conquestæ, feliciter incipiunt. Magnifico viro, domino Raymundo Fuggero, &c. Petrus Apianus Mathematicus, & Bartholomæus Amantius Poeta. D. E. D. Ingolstadii, anno MDXXXIV.

Primi, qui excerpta ex Kyriaci schedis typis excuderunt, fuere Petrus Apianus & Bartholomæus Amantius. Kyriaci Itin. præf. p. 59.

† In antiquitatibus orbis totius, à Petro Apiano & Bartholomæo Amantio foras datis, fictæ multæ sunt à diversis auctoribus inscriptiones. Aug. Dial. xi. p. 162. Menagiana, tom. iv. p. 263.—One of the first in this collection is the foolish prophecy of H. Cajadus, which will be mentioned hereafter.

‡ Alexandri Geraldini Itinerarium ad regiones sub æquinoxiali plagâ constitutas. [anno 1520 ; complectens antiquitates & ritus populorum Æthiopiæ, Africæ, Atlantici oceani, & Indicarum regionum. Accesserunt auctoris opuscula alia, edente Onuphrio Geraldino, ejus abnepote.] 8vo. Romæ, 1631.—Geraldinus was made bishop of St. Domingo, the capital of Hispaniola, in 1516, and died in 1525.

than

than all the inscriptions and antiquities, which the rest of the world could produce. But it is observable, that no traveller, besides himself, ever saw these curiosities; and, as M. de la Mothe le Vayer remarks, “it is the greatest impertinence to raise imaginary pillars, and bear testimony to the conquests and dominion of the Romans, in places, where apparently no Roman ever set his foot, and in direct opposition to their own historians \*.” Geraldinus appears to have been as great a traveller, and—as great a romancer, as Leo Africanus: *par nobile fratrum*!

In 1636, Curtius Inghiramius published a volume of Tuscan Antiquities †, containing a multitude of Latin inscriptions, relative to the origin of Volaterra, Sena, Rome, &c. which, he says, he found under-ground at Scornellum, near Volaterra. The inscriptions, he tells us, were written by one Prosperus Fesulanus, who lived in the time of Cicero ‡, and deposited by him in that place, with an epistle to the finder, in which he prophetically describes the said Inghiramius; lays many strict injunctions on him not to communicate the originals to any one; and denounces the most horrible calamities on such as should presume to steal, to touch them, to depreciate the credit of the finder, or rob him of the glory, to which he was entitled for the discovery of these inestimable treasures ||.

It

\* De la Mothe le Vayer, des anciens Historiens Grecs & Latins.

† This work is entitled, *Ethruscarum Antiquitatum Fragmenta, quibus urbis Romæ, aliarumque gentium primordia, mores, & res gestæ indicantur, à Curtio Inghiramio reperta Scornelli prope Vulterram. Francofurti, anno salutis MDCXXXVII. Ethrusco verò cIo cIo cIo cIo ccccxcv. Folio.* A former edition was printed at Florence in 1636.

‡ Bcf. Chr. 60.

|| Alius, si fortè invenerit, eas scripturas tangere non audeat; alioquin

It is easy to see the author's views in throwing out these denunciations. Though they were perfectly absurd and ridiculous, they were plainly intended to check the impertinent curiosity, the animadversions, and the ridicule of his opposers.

The whole performance however bears the most obvious marks of fraud and imposition \*. The characters do not in the least correspond with the mode of writing in the time of Cicero ; the Latinity is mean and barbarous ; the customs, which are occasionally mentioned, were unknown in ancient Rome ; and the stories, which are told of the patriarch Noah, are alone sufficient to expose the grossness of the cheat.

To these remarks we may add, that the artist very simply and inadvertently wrote his inscriptions on paper, which was known to have been made about the time of the pretended discovery †.

Some have ascribed this performance to Postellus ‡ ; some, to Paganinus Gaudentius ; others affirm, that the author was Thomas Phædrus or Fœdrus, who was keeper of the Vatican library, about the year 1490. It is most probable, that Inghiramius himself was the real fabricator of all these ridiculous inscriptions ||.

alioquin superum infernorumque deorum iram expertus peribit infelix . . . Si quis has scripturas quovis modo sibi arripuerit, fame et corporis jacturam faciet . . . Si quis nomen suum augere his scripturis, vel tuum deprimere fuerit ausus, rerum suarum, vite, & honoris, maximum damnum passus omnibus ludibrio erit. Verum nec hæredes tui nec tu, inventas scripturas aliis dare audeatis, nam malum instat, sed transcriptas poteris dare cui volueris, &c. p. 3, 4.

\* Vid. Leon. Allatii Animadversiones in Antiquitatum Etruscarum Fragmenta, ab Inghiramius edita, 4to. Paris, 1640.

† Ibid. p. 91.

‡ Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. i. c. 9. p. 41.

|| Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 13. § 3. p. 601. Vid. Saxii Onomast. vol. iv. p. 422. Placcii Theat. Pædon. p. 523.

E e

But



But the most enterprizing and eminent practitioner in the art of making fictitious inscriptions, was Annius of Viterbo, whom I have already mentioned. Antonius Augustinus gives us the following account of the process, which Annius observed in his forgeries.

“ Mihi Latinus Latinus \* Viterbiensis, vir doctus, bonæque fidei, de Joanne Annio, Viterbiensi monacho, narrare jucundè solebat. Lapidem insculpendas curasse literas, quem vineæ infodi jusserrat, non procul à Viterbio. Cùmque fodienda esset vinea, ad lapidem usque ut fodiendo pervenirent jussit; narrans in libris se reperisse, templum ibi orbis terrarum antiquissimum latere. Terram jam effossam, primus, qui lapidem invenit, vinitor accurrit; paulatim detegi sarcophagum imperat. Hic stupens, lapidis antiquitatem, & literas à se confectas, admiratur; ac describens, ad urbis senatores lætus confugit, & civitatis honori fore persuadet, in amplissimo publicè spectari loco. Viterbii enim urbis originem contineri, quæ bis mille annis Romanam esset urbem à Romulo conditam longè antiquior, utpote ab Iside & Osiride conditæ. Fabulas hic suas, quibus abundabat, venditavit, factumque ut ille jusserrat. Fertur manuscripta inscriptio ficta, typis etiam evulgata, hoc initio, EGO SUM ISIS †.”

“ Latinus Latinus, a native of Viterbo, a man of learning and veracity, used to relate, with some humour, the following anecdote of John Annio, a dominican friar of that city.

“ Annio got an inscription engraved on a stone, which he buried in a vineyard near Viterbo. When

\* Latinus Latinus was born at Viterbo about the year 1513. He published notes on Tertullian, and a work, entitled, *Bibliotheca sacra et profana, sive observationes, correctiones, conjecturæ, & variae lectiones.*

† August. Dial. xi. p. 160.



the labourers were employed in digging the ground, he directed them to proceed, till they came to the spot, where the stone was deposited; telling them he had found in his books, that the ruins of the most ancient temple in the world lay under-ground in that place. After the earth was removed, the stone actually appeared; upon which the vine-dresser, who first discovered this wonderful curiosity, ran to Annius, and acquainted him with what he had found. The sarcophagus was ordered to be removed with all possible care. Annius, in the mean time, seemed to be astonished at the antiquity of the stone, and extremely delighted with the inscription. In the height of his pretended exultation, he flew to the magistrates of Viterbo, expatiated on the nature and importance of the discovery, and persuaded them, that this venerable monument of antiquity would be an everlasting honour to the city, if they would remove it to a conspicuous place, where it might be publicly exhibited. He observed, that it related to the origin of Viterbo; and that Rome, founded 2000 years since by Romulus, was far inferior in point of antiquity to Viterbo, which was built by Isis and Osiris. With these romantic stories, which he readily invented, he amused the public; and his orders were instantly obeyed. An inscription was circulated in manuscript, and afterwards printed, beginning with these words, *EGO SUM ISIS, I am Isis.*"

A project of the same kind was managed, with some success, by one Hermicus Cajadus, or Hermio Gajado, a Portuguese poet, about the year 1505 \*. When his countrymen had made a conquest of several places in Africa, and the East Indies, he composed some Latin verses, in the style of a Sibylline prophecy, foretelling these conquests; and having engraved them on three marble columns, he MUTILATED THE STONES, and

\* Cajadus died of intoxication in 1508. *Ladvocat.*

DEFACED some of the inscriptions, in order to give them an appearance of antiquity. He then buried them in the ground; and, at a proper opportunity, contrived a scheme for the discovery, which was artfully managed, and attended with great exultation. The inscription, which was undefaced, was read, admired, touched and kissed, with the profoundest veneration; and afterwards published as a divine prophecy \*.

The Duilian inscription has been reckoned a most

\* Is Latinis carminibus commentus fuerat Sibyllinam vaticinationem, in columnis marmoreis incisam, quæ per ambages significabat, Indos sub imperium & ditionem Lusitanorum esse venturos, eosque lapides datâ operâ DETRUNCATOS, ut aliqua inessent ANTIQUITATIS vestigia, obrui præcepit . . . . Ubi verò defossâ marmora aliquod vitium fecisse, ex humore terreno, judicavit, ad certam diem, simulatâ delectationis causâ, invitat amicos in villam suam, quæ proxima erat loco, ubi obrutum latebat vaticinium. Cum igitur accubuissem omnes, ecce villicus nunciat Hermico, mercenarias ejus operas, dum in fundo fossionibus incumberent, incidisse in lapides, in quibus inscriptæ essent literæ, indices magni cujusdam thesauri, eodem loco defossi; sic enim rustici opinabantur. Nec morâ, omnes simul, alacritate ingenti, relictis epulis, accurrunt, defossas intuentur columnas, confestimque extrahi jubent; in quibus incisa hujusmodi erant carmina Sibyllina:

Sibyllæ vaticinium, occidiis decretum.  
 Volventur saxa literis, & ordine rectis,  
 Cum videas occidens orientis opes.  
 Ganges Indus Tagus erit, mirabile visu,  
 Merces commutabit suas uterque sibi.  
 Soli æterno, ac lunæ decretum.

Tum vero omnes, pro se quisque legere, admirari, versus illos fatidicos venerari, manu tangere, exosculari . . . . Ita Sibyllina fabula vires acquirit eundo, ac tandem per totum terrarum orbem divulgata, fides ei ubique et auctoritas adjungitur, hodièque typis excusa circumfertur in fronte codicis, cui titulus est, “Inscriptiones antiquæ.” Varrerii Censura in quendam Auctorem, qui sub falsâ Inscriptione Berolii Chaldei circumfertur, p. 15. edit. 1598. Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 13. vol. ii. p. 607.

curious

curious and valuable relic of antiquity \*, yet Selden seems to question its authenticity ; for having occasion to mention its age, in speaking of the Parian Chronicle, he intimates his suspicions in these words, *si nimirum genuina est* †.

Reinesius asserts, that Fulvius Ursinus has published many fictitious inscriptions ‡.

Fleetwood, in his *Inscriptionum Antiquarum Sylloge*, informs his readers, that though he was, as much as possible, on his guard against false and fictitious inscriptions, he often found, that he had inadvertently inserted, “*plurimas apertè spurias,*” many that are evi-

\* C. Duilius commanded the Roman fleet in the first Carthaginian war, and gained a complete victory. To perpetuate the memory of this triumph, a pillar of white marble was erected to his honour at Rome. This pillar is called *Columna rostrata*, from the rostra, or beaks of ships, with which it was adorned. On the basis of the column was an inscription, recording the exploits of Duilius, and the value of the booty, which was taken in the Carthaginian ships. The remains of this pillar were accidentally dug up, in the year 1560, in the place, which was formerly the *Forum Romanum* : and, by the order of Cardinal Alexander Farnese, was removed to the capitol.

The inscription, which is in old Latin, is supposed to have been written 260 years before the Christian æra, and is reckoned the most ancient Latin monument now remaining.

Justus Lipsius endeavoured to supply the deficiencies in the inscription. Pet. Ciacconius did the same, and explained the sense in a learned commentary, entitled, *Pet. Ciacconii in Columnæ Rostratæ C. Duilii inscriptionem, à se conjecturâ suppletam, Commentarius*. Lug. Bat. 1597. *Græv. Thesaur.* tom. iv. p. 1807. *Univ. Hist.* vol. xvii. p. 224. 506. xii. p. 171. edit. 1740.

† Seld. *Marm. Arund.* in edit. *Ansæ*, p. 3.

‡ De Urino dixeram, cautè me arripere solere, quas ab ipso professas scirem, inscriptiones ; & paratus sum, si quis postulet, *FICTITIAS* cum *PLURIMAS* extrusisse probare. Reinesii ad Rupertum *Epist.* 50. p. 456. *Epist.* 43. p. 418. *Epist.* 51. p. 487. 490. *Fabric. Bibl. Lat.* l. iv. c. 5.

dently



dently spurious \*. And Stillingfleet affirms, that there are many counterfeits in Gruter's collection †.

As a farther confirmation of what I have here observed, I shall subjoin the remarks of a learned writer, who in this instance, has advanced none of his usual paradoxes.

“ Falsarum inscriptionum architectos proximum nostro sæculum INNUMEROS tulit; egregios artifices, qui, quas ipsi magnâ, ut sibi quidem videbantur, arte concinnassent, has aut in marmoribus, aut in tabulis æneis, plumbeisve, aut lateritiis fistulis, aut in antiquis denique numismatis, lectas à se fuisse mentirentur. Sed et aliquot ante ætatibus fraus eadem in usu fuit. Plena sunt pergamena manu exarata fictis in otio inscriptionibus, epitaphiis, elogiis; quæ cum inde eruuntur à viris etiam alioqui magnis ac probis, sed minus justo suspiciosi, ab eorumdem suffragio pondus illa accipiunt; ac deinde mirificè inquinant perturbantque prophanam historiam, utinam verò non etiam ecclesiasticam.

“ Superiore porrò sæculo, insigniores harum inscriptionum fabricatores fuere Jovianus Pontanus, Pomponius Lætus, Joannes Camers, Cyriacus Aconitanus, aliique ‡. Hos enim in primis nominatim designat Antonius Augustinus, Dialogo xi. p. 161. E Cyriaci verò officinâ plurimas in Annales Hispaniæ transfudit Ambrosius Morales ||, et exinde Gruterus in Thesaurum suum; è tot autem inscriptionibus nullum hodie in

\* Epist. dedic. p. 10.

† “ Not only authors, but other monuments of antiquity, were then counterfeited, as appears by many in Gruter's Collection of Inscriptions.” Stillingf. Orig. Brit. pref. p. 1.

‡ Jovianus Pontanus fl. circa 1450. Saxii Onomast. Pomponius Lætus, circa 1484. Ibid. Joannes Camers, circa 1510. Ibid.

|| Ambrosius Moralis, sive de Morales, circa 1574.



Hispaniâ legi, testis est idem Antonius Augustinus, vir summæ eruditionis, limatique judicii, qui de Joanne Annio, Italisque alijs præterea conqueritur, quòd suæ, nempe Hispaniæ, genti epigrammata et marmora obtruserint, nec visa illis, nec ab Hispanis reperta; atque eademum ille cum Amadisii Gallici et Orlandi Furiosi nugis commentisque confert. Inscriptionum hujusmodi immensam suppellectilem, quadraginta amplius digestam voluminibus, olim collegit Pyrrhus Ligorius; quæ Romæ extare dicitur in bibliothecâ Barberinnâ et Farnesianâ. Quâ in vastâ mole atque congerie, Spanhemius, vir eruditus, confitetur, p. 141. “plura esse aut dubiæ fidei, aut confessæ novitatis.” Nec tantam ille crevisse segetem putat, nisi ex plurimorum fraude, qui Ligorio viro bono fucum fecerint. Farraginem eam esse subdit, quæ possit incautis imponere, avidis ad quamcumque ciborum novitatem, viris etiam alioquin eruditis, sed, ut dixi, minime suspiciosi. Neque enim HEBETES ac STULTI sunt, qui dant operam, ut hâc arte fallant. Sic Muretus olim Scaligero ipsi imposuit, quem induxit ut crederet, Attii et Trabeæ\*, veterum, ut aiunt, poetarum carmina quædam esse; quæ idem Muretus, à se conficta, sub eorum nominibus Scaligero submiserat. E veteribus etiam schedis Josephi Scaligeri describitur à Grutero posita, ut quidem ait, Nicomediæ inscriptio: quis hanc, amabo, ad Scaligerum Nicomediâ attulit?

“Atqui non Gruterum modò, sed et eos, qui volumini ejus amplificando suam veluti symbolam contulerunt, fefellerunt ii, qui vel ex marmoribus ea se descripsisse elogia testati sunt; vel eruta ex membranis fallacibus inculpere lapidibus, superiore præsertim sæculo, ad aliquam patriæ suæ laudem, incautè fategerunt; vel QUI

\* See an account of this imposition in Fabric. Bibl. Lat. l. iv. c. 1. p. 198. edit. 1728.

DENIQUE INSIGNI FRAUDE INSCULPSERE IPSI, AC TELLURI SUFFODERUNT, QUÆ DEINDE VEL IPSI-MET, VEL POSTERI, EFFOSSA INGENTI AURO VENDERENT. Vix enim repertum erutumve talem fuisse lapidem reperias, ante annum MDX. Post hunc annum innumera sunt, eo quem diximus astu, reperta. Itaque in illo Thesauro Gruteriano INFINITI CARBONES LATENT. Neque ex sexaginta ferè inscriptionibus, quæ Constantiniani hujus sæculi esse æstimantur, vel una quidem sincera est, si inscriptionem Arcûs Constantiani exceperis \*.”

Similar observations occur in almost every author, who has written upon the subject.

\* Harduini Opera Selecta, p. 501.

## C H A P. XVII.

**T**HE examples, which I have produced in the foregoing chapter, will, I think, be sufficient to shew, what frauds have been committed, in the fabrication of inscriptions ; and with what CAUTION we should credit such memorials.

In a question of importance, like the present, a writer, who is in pursuit of truth, will examine every circumstance with impartiality and freedom ; and if he sees so many difficulties on every side, that he can form no SATISFACTORY conclusion, he will suspend his opinion, and be content to remain in the number of those, “ who neither believe nor disbelieve every thing :”

ΟΥΤΕ ΠΑΣΙ ΠΙΣΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ, ΟΥΤΕ ΠΑΣΙΝ ΑΠΙΣΤΟΥΝΤΕΣ \*.

This precaution is the more necessary, in the present instance, as supposititious books and inscriptions have been so numerous, and are, in reality, a disgrace to the republic of letters. Without any breach of charity we may assert, that he, who obtrudes any thing upon the world, under the name of antiquity, which has no title to that venerable character, deserves to be branded, as the worst of impostors ; or, to use the language of Plautus, sent to live,

Apud fustitudinas, ferrirepinas insulas,  
Ubi vivos homines mortui incurvant boves †.

Whoever

\* Arist. Rhet. l. ii. c. 14.

† Plaut. Aſin. act. i. sc. 1. 20.—Fustitudinas and ferrirepinas are words coined by Plautus. Mortui boves is a humorous

Whoever was the author of the Parian Chronicle, he stands in a higher class, than many of the modern forgers I have mentioned. His performance is written in a clear and classical style. It bears the marks of real learning, and a competent knowledge of Grecian history; so that in whatever light it is viewed, it is no contemptible production.

It is however worthy of observation, that the illustrious Sir Isaac Newton paid NO REGARD to its authority, in his Chronology of ancient Kingdoms.

The sixteenth century, and the former part of the seventeenth, prior to the discovery of the marbles, produced a multitude of grammarians, critics, commentators, and writers of every denomination, deeply versed in Grecian literature, and amply qualified for the compilation of such a short system of chronology, as that of the Arundelian marbles.

Above all, the science of chronology was particularly studied and investigated about that time. “Nunc fervet chronologia,” says Scaliger in the year 1605; “omnes hoc ferrum excalfaciunt\*.” And Casaubon treats those persons with contempt, who were unacquainted with the improvements, which had been made in that department of learning, after the revival of letters. “Scientia temporum,” says he, “quantopere fuerit post renatas literas exulta, quàm admiranda acceperit incrementa, ASINUS est qui ignorat inter literatos; malignus, & beneficiorum DEI erga hoc seculum ingratus æstimator, qui dissimulat. Stupenda enim sunt,

phrase for strappadoes or whips, made of leather. A late translator renders these lines,

“In Club-island, and in that of Rattle-chain,  
Where the dead oxen gore the living men.”

\* Scal. Epist. inter Opuscula, p. 521.



quæ viri summi in nostrâ præsertim Galliâ & Germaniâ præstiterunt \*.”

Innumerable systems of chronology had been published before the year 1625; from which it was easy to extract a series of memorable events, and give the compilation a Grecian dress.

The avidity, with which all relics of antiquity were then collected, and the price, at which they were purchased, were sufficient inducements to any one, whose avarice, or whose necessity, was stronger than his integrity, to engrave his lucubrations on marble, and transmit them to Smyrna, as a commodious emporium for such rarities †.

Whether

\* Casaub. in Baron. Annal. exercit. 1. num. 99. p. 111.—Casaubon's preliminary discourse is dated 1614. He died July 1, 1614, aged 55.

† In those days, there were numbers of learned Greeks, ready to engage in any fraudulent scheme, which was calculated to procure them any emolument. I shall take the liberty to mention one of this class.

Critopulus Metrophanes was sent into England and Germany, by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Alexandria, to gain information concerning the state and doctrine of the protestant churches in Europe.

Archbishop Abbot, in a letter to Sir Thomas Roe, then ambassador at Constantinople, recommends this gentleman in the following terms.

——“ I recommend unto you this bearer Critophilus Metrophanes, a Greeke, borne in Byrræa, and sent unto mee five or six yeeres since by Cyrill, then patriarke of Alexandria; and now of Constantinople. Hee hath remained all his time in Oxford, where I have taken care, that hee hath bene well and sufficiently maintained, and thereby hath attained unto some reasonable knowledge of the English tongue, not neglecting his studies otherwise. Hee is a learned man, and hath lived in that university with good report, whereof he is able to shew letters testimoniall to the good content-

ment,

ment,

Whether this was the case with the Parian Chronicle or not ; whether it is an authentic monument of antiquity,

ment, as I hope, of that reverend man, from whom he was sent \*.

.....

Lambeth, Nov. 20, 1622.

In a second letter to Sir Thomas, the archbishop gives a very different character of this learned Greek, as follows.

..... The Grecian Critopylus Metrophanes hath taken his journey very lately, into France or Holland, pretending from thence to go by land to Constantinople. I bred him full five yeeres in Oxford, with good allowance for diet, cloaths, bookes, chamber, and other necessaries ; so that his expence, since his comeing into England, doth amount almost to three hundred pounds. Whiles hee was in that university, hee carried himselfe well ; and at Michaelmas last I sent for him to Lambeth, taking care that in a very good shippe, hee might bee conveyed with accomodation of all things by the way. But by the ill counsell of some body, hee desired to go to the court at Newmarket, that hee might see the king before his departure. His majesty used him well ; but there hee was putt into a conceite, that hee might gett some thinge to buy him bookes to cary home to the patriarke. The meanes that hee gaped after were such as you can hardly beleeve ; at first, that hee should have a knight to bee made for his sake ; and then, after that, a baronet, wherein a projector should have shared with him : after that, the kinge was to be moved to give the advowson of a benefice, which a false simoniacal person did promise to buy of him. I caused my chaplaines to dissuade him from these thinges, and interposed mine owne censure in it, as thinking these courses to bee vnwise, vnfit, and vnworthy. But, to satisfy his desire, I bought him new out of the shoppe many of the best Greeke authors, and among them Chrysostome's eight tomes. I furnished him also with other bookes of worth, in Latin and in English, so that I may boldly say, it was a present fitt for mee to send to the patriarke of Constantinople. In the meane time, since Michaelmas last, I lodged him in my owne house, I sett him at my owne table, I cloathed him, and provided all conveniences for him ; and would once againe

\* Roe's Negot. let. 63. p. 102.

quity, or a modern compilation; whether its authority is indisputable, or, as I am inclined to think, APOCRYPHAL,

have sent him away in a good shippe, that hee might safely have returned: but he fell into the company of certain Grecks, with whom wee have been much troubled for collections and otherwise; and although I knew them to bee counterfeits and vagabonds (as sundry times you have written unto me) yet I could not keepe my man within dores, but hee must bee abroad with them, to the expence of his time and mony. In breefe, writing a kind of epistle unto mee, that he would rather loose his bookes, suffer imprisonment, and losse of his life, then go home in any shippe; but that he would see the parts of christendome, and better his experience that way. I found that hee ment to turne roague and beggar, and more I cannot tell what; and therevpon I gave him ten pounds in his purse, and leaving him to Sir Paul Pindares care, at my remooving to Croydon, about a fortnights since, I dismist him. I had heard before of the basenes and slavishnes of that nation; but I could never have beleaved, that any creature in humane shape, having learning, and such education as he hath had heere, could, after so many yeeres, have bene so farre from ingenuity, or any gratefull respect. But he must take his fortune, and I will learne by him to intreate so well no more of his fashion. Onley I have thus at large acquainted you with the vnworthy carriage of this fellow, which, though it bee indecent in him, yet for the patriarks sake I grudge it not vnto him. . . I remayne, &c. \*

Croyden, Aug. 12, 1623.

Sir Thomas answers:

. . . . I have lett the good patriarch know the devious course taken by Metrophanes, of your bounty, and care for him, and all the circumstances of his departure. Att first hee seemed somewhat astonished; butt his affection towards him prevailed to make his excuse . . . . Hee hath given order to write into Holland, France, and diuers other parts, to recall this straye sheepe, to whom hee beares an entire loue; and if hee come hither, intends to make him a kind of coadiutor in judging of causes, and to conferr vpon him all the dignity hee can † . . . .

Constant. June 24, 1623.

\* Roe's Negot. let. 3. p. 171.

† Ibid. let. 142. p. 214.



PHAL, I shall now leave to the determination of the judicious and impartial reader.

Though

In a third letter, the archbishop says :

——— I hold it fitt to give the patriarcke this account of Metrophanes ; that in July last I gave him viaticum to carry him to Constantinople by land ; and for a long time after, I heard of him, but saw him not ; only in February or March last, hee came unto mee, and told mee, that hee was resolved then speedily to go home by sea, and would know what service I would command him. I told him, that for seven or eight moneths, hee had not knowne mee, and now I would not know him ; he might go where hee list, and might do what hee pleased. I thought then hee had gone away ; but now, two daies past, being in my coach at London, I saw him go by me ; but what hee intendeth, or what hee hath done with the bookes which I gave him for the patriarche, I can yeeld no account \*.

Lambeth, June 20, 1724.

Sir Thomas answers :

. . . I have acquainted the patriarch with your graces first and last letters concerning Metrophanes ; who can heare nothing against him, that affection doth not enterprett to the better. Hee expects him daily, and your worthy present of bookes. I feare they will be pawned in the way. Of wandering Greeks there is so GREAT STORE, that I am forced daily to deny my passports † . . . .

Constantinople, Dec. 9—19, 1624.

In a fourth letter, the archbishop gives this farther account of the good patriarch's "straye sheepe."

. . . . I knowe not what to saye to the patriarke touching Metrophanes. His rogish countrey men did vndoe him : hee had bene fairely caried to Constantinople by sea, and I gave him viaticum to that purpose ; but hee is gone with pretence to travaile throughe Germany by lande, in whiche course I cannot see how hee should carye the bookes alonge with him. I do muche feare, that hee hath

\* Roc's Negot. let. 173. p. 253. † Ibid. let. 229. p. 320.



Though its authenticity, I believe, has hitherto been unquestioned; nay, though it has been held in the highest estimation by men of distinguished learning, I flatter

fared so well in these parts, that hee will hardly reduce himselfe to the strict life of the Coloires in the Greek church \* . . . .

Lambeth, Mar 30, 1625.

Sir Thomas, in his answer to the archbishop, says,

. . . . "Of his Metrophanes, hee [the patriarch] hath at last heard from Nurenburgh, who writes him a strange discourse, that Gondomar did seeke to debauch him, and send him to Rome; but failing, attempted his life, which made him forsake England; with many other friuolous adventures. I wished the patriarch to beleeve little: but hee willingly heares nothing against him, vpon whom hee hath sett his affection. The truth is, they are futilissima natio. Long slavery hath made them, for the most part, lyars, base, and treacherous †."——

[No date.]

Metrophanes spent some time at Tubingen, Helmeſtadt, Altdorff, and other places in Germany. Upon his return home he obtained preferment in the Greek church at Constantinople, and afterwards became patriarch of Alexandria!

He wrote a confession of faith for the Greek church, entitled, *Ὁμολογία τῆς ανατολικῆς Εκκλησίας*, which was republished, with a Latin version by Joannes Horneius, at Helmeſtadt, in 1661. The original, says Königiſius, is composed, "ſtilo puro et elegante." Königiſii Bibl. p. 537. Conringius, in a preface to the *Ὁμολογία*, ſpeaks of his abilities in theſe terms: Potuit ſanè, quod rogatus erat, optimè omnium præſtare; quandoquidem valebat ingenio, judicio, et doctrinâ non proletariâ.

The deſign of this note is, not to charge Metrophanes with any forgery; but to ſhew, that there were men of learning among the Greeks, and unprincipled adventurers, who might be prompted to impoſe upon the world, by views of lucre, by vanity, or even by REVENGE. And this may ſerve as a caution to thoſe, who may hereafter be induced to purchaſe antiquities in the Eaſt.

\* Roe's Negot. let. 262. p. 373.

† Ibid. let. 347. p. 488.

myself there can be no impropriety in this disquisition. On the most important subject, that can possibly engage the attention of the human mind, we are directed to avoid an implicit credulity, and “to prove all things” by an impartial examination.

If the objections, which I have here alleged against the authenticity of this celebrated Chronicle, should be answered with liberality and candor, I shall readily join with the author in admitting its authority ; for truth, and truth only, is the object of this enquiry \*.

If, on the contrary, this essay should be treated with asperity ; if I should be accused of depreciating a venerable monument of ancient learning ; if any dictatorial critic should exclaim in the language of Horace,

———fragili quærens illidere dentem,  
Offendet solido ! Sat. l. ii. 1. 77.

or, in the plenitude of his benevolence, should advise me to

—————remember Milo's end,  
 Wedg'd in the timber, which he strove to rend,  
 I shall comfort myself by reflecting, that sarcasms and  
 contumely are no arguments ; that the antiquities of  
 Berosus and Manetho, as they are exhibited by Anniius  
 of Viterbo, have been warmly defended ; and that the  
 most violent exclamations have been raised against  
 those, who have called in question the most notorious  
 forgeries, the letters of Abgarus †, Lentulus ‡, Pi-  
 late,

\* Ego quid sentiam simpliciter indicavi, libenter παλινωδῶσων, et in diversam iturus sententiam, si quis docuerit rectiora. Porro, si quis, cum id non possit, tamen odiosius obstreperit, ac studio rapi, quàm judicio mavult, ne cum hoc quidem unquam tria verba commutaverim. Erasmi præf. ad tom. iv. Hieron. p. 4.

† Fabric. Cod. Apoc. vol. i. p. 317.

‡ In some copies the epistle bears this title: **Lentulus Hieroso-**  
**lymitanorum**

late \*, Seneca to St. Paul †, and, above all, that collection of ancient rubbish, the Oracles of the Sibyls ‡.

lymitanorum præses, S. P. D. Romano S. Vid. Fabric. Cod. Apoc. vol. i. p. 302.

\* Ibid. p. 298.

† Eight letters from Seneca to St. Paul, and six from the Apostle to Seneca. Ibid. vol. ii. p. 892. Sixt. Sinens. Bibl. l. ii.

‡ A collection of Sibylline Oracles, in eight books, was published by Xyftus Betuleius, in 1545, 8vo. by Joh. Opsopæus, in 1589, 8vo. by Servatius Gallæus, in 1688, 4to.—The learned H. Dodwell calls this collection a counterfeit by some Christian author; and observes, that it was not reduced into the form, in which we now have it, before the end of the second century. Dodwell, Letter of Advice, &c. p. 114. Blondel on the Sibyls. Banier, Mythol. l. iv. ch. 2. Clerici Art. Crit. tom. ii. p. 345.

Supposing there were really such priestesses, as are usually called Sibyls, it is amazing, that men of sense and learning should contend for the divine inspiration of FANATICAL OLD WOMEN! Persius speaks like a more rational philosopher, when he says.

—VETERES AVIAS tibi de pulmone revello.

Sat. v. 92.

F I N I S.



---

---

# I N D E X.

## A.

**A**BBOT, archbishop, his letters to Sir Thomas Roe, 219—222.  
—— his account of Metrophanes, *ibid.*

Accius imagines, that Hesiod lived before Homer, 124, 125.

Acusilaus, his genealogical tables, 75.

Ægius Spoletinus, an error in his translation of Apollodorus, 153.

Ægos-potamos, a stone said to fall in or near that river, 38.

—— observations on that story, 157.

—— Conon defeated there, 79.

Æschylus, present at the battle of Marathon, 36.

Ætna, eruptions of that mountain, 156.

Africanus, his opinion of Grecian chronology, 100.

Alexander, the time of his birth, 41.

—— a spurious history of, 91.

Alexandrian library, 69.

—— MS. 55, 173.

Alphonfus, his encomium on Q. Curtius, 146.

Alyattes reigns in Lydia, 32.

Ammonians, who they were, 65.

Ammonius, his account of literary forgeries, 191.

Amphietyon, 24.

Amphietyones assemble at Thermopylæ, 24.

—— take Cirrha, 32.

Amabasis, the meaning of that word, 39.

# I N D E X.

- Annius of Viterbo**, the books he forged, 194.  
 — his inscriptions, 210, 211.  
**Antiquities**, collected with avidity, 219.  
**Apianus, Pet.** his inscriptions, 207.  
**Apollodorus**, some account of his writings, 96.  
 — a passage in his *Bibliotheca* corrupted, 150.  
 — a passage improperly translated, 151.  
 — his account of *Deucalion*, *ibid.*  
**Apollonius Tyaneus**, 65.  
**Archaisms** in the *Chronicle*, 56—58.  
**Archias**, conducted a colony to *Syracuse*, 31.  
**Archilochus**, his character, 80.  
**Aristeas**, his history of the *LXX.* a contemptible fiction, 44, 123.  
 — written by some *Hellenistic-Jew*, 138.  
**Aristides**, when he was archon, 130.  
**Aristobulus**, when he lived, 137.  
**Aristotle**, an account of his library, 147.  
 — his numerous commentators, *ibid.*  
 — many pieces falsely ascribed to him, 191.  
 — the number of his books, *ibid.*  
**Arundel, Thomas earl of**, his genealogy, 45.  
 — letters to him, 172.  
**Arundel-house**, 47.  
**Astyanax**, archon at *Paros*, 23.  
**Athenæus**, on the number of the *Athenians*, 140.  
**Athenians**, when they began their year, 116.  
**Athens** taken by *Lyfander*, 79.  
 — by *Sylla*, 147.  
**Attic months**, 116, 117.  
 — year, *ibid.*  
**Attica**, its twelve cities, 29.  
 — the number of its inhabitants, 140.  
**Augustinus, Ant.** his remarks on spurious inscriptions, 206.  
**Autochthon**, 23.

# I N D E X.

## B.

- B** A B Y L O N I A N empire, its antiquity, 85.  
Babylonians, their astronomical observations, 65, 66.  
————— why they wrote on tiles, 66.  
Banier, his account of Minos, 28.  
———— asserts, that the Chronicle was dug up in the isle of Paros, 170.  
Bentley, his translation of the 55th epocha, 37.  
———— his remark on the modern pronunciation of  $\mu$ , 58.  
———— his account of literary forgeries, 182.  
———— his Dissertation on Phalaris, 189.  
———— his opinion of the Consolatio, ascribed to Cicero, 193.  
 $\epsilon\iota\beta\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\phi\omicron\varsigma$ , a literary undertaker, or a COLLECTOR of books, 147.  
Boëthius, Hector, when he wrote, 182.  
Books and volumes, mentioned by Moses, &c. 67.  
Boyle, Hon. Mr. his controversy with Bentley, 189.  
Brutus, Marcus, epistles ascribed to him, 184.

## C.

- C** A D M U S goes into Greece, 25.  
Cajadus, H. his forged inscriptions, 211, 212.  
Callisthenes wrote a history of Greece, 91.  
———— a fictitious history under his name, 91, 92.  
Capellus, on the date of the destruction of Troy, 117.  
Casaubon, his opinion of literary forgers, 196.  
Cave on supposititious books, 198.  
Cecrops I. reigns at Athens, 24.  
Censorinus, a conjectural emendation of a passage in his treatise de  
D. N. 113, 115.



# I N D E X.

- Ceres comes to Attica, 26.
- Chandler, Dr. publishes his *Marmora*, 51.
- his edition of the *Chronicle* commended, *ibid.*
- ascribes the *Chronicle* to Demetrius Phalereus, 129.
- Chatterton, an account of him, 203.
- Chronology, not observed by the ancient Greeks, 83.
- when it began to assume a new form, 98.
- when particularly studied, 218.
- many systems published, 219.
- Cicero, not the author of the *Consolatio*, 193.
- Cirrha, the inhabitants besiege Delphi, 32.
- Clemens Alexandrinus, his chronological citations, 109.
- Comedies, carried in carts, 33.
- Comet, mentioned in the *Chronicle*, 40.
- Conon gains a victory, 79.
- Corinth, the burning of that city, 97.
- Corn, first sown in the Rharian plain, 27.
- Corfani, on the Attic months, 116.
- the destruction of Troy, 117.
- the epistles ascribed to Themistocles, 189.
- Cranaus reigns at Athens, 24, 150.
- Creon, first annual archon, 31.
- Cræsus, 34, 102.
- Ctesias, his account of Cyrus, 89.
- his character, 162, 164.
- Curtius, Q. not mentioned by the ancients, 144—148.
- epistles under his name, 148.
- Cybele, her image appeared, 26.
- Cyclades, possessed by the Carians, &c. 78, 79.
- Cynossena, the battle at that place, 86.
- Cyriacus Anconitanus, his inscriptions, 206.
- Cyris Lucar, his extravagant account of the Alexandrian MS. 173.
- his partiality for Metrophanes, 222.
- Cyrus takes Sardes, 34.

# I N D E X.

Cyrus, various accounts of his birth, &c. 88—90.  
 — the younger, his anabasis, 39, 167, 168.

## D.

**D**AMIS the Assyrian, his memoirs, 65.  
 Danaus sails from Egypt, 25.

— goes into Greece, 25.

Daniel secundum LXX, published at Rome, 128.

Dares Phrygius, the history ascribed to him, 187.

Darius began his reign, 35, 164.

— his preparations for invading Greece, 163.

— the time of his death, 162, 163.

Decalogue, written upon stones, 75.

Delphi, the temple of, plundered, 41.

Demetrii, many of that name, 135, 192.

Demetrius Judæus, 134.

— Phalereus, not the author of the Chronicle, 128—141.

— numbered the inhabitants of Attica, 140.

— governor of Athens, 140.

— retires into Egypt, 135, 139.

— probably not the author of the treatise on Elocution, 192.

— killed by the bite of an asp, 136.

Deucalion, the deluge in his time, 24.

— circumstances relating to him, 151.

Diety's Cretenfis, the history ascribed to him, 188.

Διδασκεῖν δράμα, the meaning of that phrase, 34, 35.

Διμυλὸς λίθος, a remark on that expression, 157.

Diodorus Siculus, his opinion of the Grecian chronology, 104.

— his date of the Trojan war, 114.

Dionysius Argivus, his date of the Trojan war, 113.

— Halicarnassens, his date of the Trojan war, 114.

— the tyrant, dies, 40.

— his son succeeds him, *ibid.*

Diotimus,

# I N D E X.

Diotimus, archon at Athens, 41.

Diphtheræ, used for writing, 67.

Docere fabulam, the import and origin of this phrase, 34, 35.

Dodwell, his opinion of those, who pretended to copy inscriptions, 64.

Douglas, Mr. his vindication of Milton, 201.

Du Fresnoy says, the Chronicle was found in Paros, 169.

Du Pin reports, that the Chronicle was found in Paros, *ibid*,

## E.

**E**ϛ, instead of εϛ and εϛ, 56.

    Egypt, its history full of incredible fictions, 85.

Eleusis or Eleusin, 27.

—— the Eleusinian mysteries, 27.

Ephorus, an account of his writings, 91.

—— makes Homer and Hesiod contemporaries, 125.

Erasmus, his opinion of the epistles of Phalaris, &c. 184.

—— of some of the dialogues ascribed to Plato, 190.

Eratoſthenes, some account of him, 93.

—— his chronology, 94.

—— his date of the Trojan war, 113.

Erichtheus reigns at Athens, 26.

Erichthonius joins horses to a chariot, 25.

Ethopœiæ, what they were, 183.

Euhemerus, an account of him, 63.

Eumolpus celebrates the mysteries, 27.

Euripides, when born, 36, 165.

—— dies, 39.

Eusebius differs from the author of the Chronicle, 119.

Ezekiel represents Jerusalem on a tile, 66.



# I N D E X.

## F.

**F**ORGERIES, literary, some account of, 182—205.

————— when the forging of books began to be in fashion, 183.

————— under the name of Homer, Virgil, &c. 194.

————— of Jewish and apostolical writers, 196.

————— of the fathers, 198.

————— of the Popish writers, 199.

————— of Psalmanazar, *ibid.*

————— of Lauder, 200—202.

————— of Ossian's works, 202.

————— of Chatterton, 203, 204.

————— of the inscriptions of Cyriacus Anconitanus, 206.

————— of Pet. Apianus, 207.

————— of Barth. Amantius, *ibid.*

————— of Alex. Geraldinus, *ibid.*

————— of Curt. Inghiramius, 208, 209.

————— of Annii Viterbienſis, 210, 211.

————— of H. Cajadus, 180, 211, 212.

————— of others, 213—216.

## G.

**G**ALE, Dr. an error in his edition of Apollodorus, 153.

Galen, his account of literary impostors, 191.

———— published an account of his writings, 193.

———— books falsely ascribed to him, 194.

Gassendus, his Life of M. Peireſc, 175.

———— an error in his computation, 177.

Gelasius Cyzicenus, pretends to have found an ancient manuscript, 65.

———— pope, his decree, 196, 197.

# I N D E X.

- Gelo, when he became tyrant of Syracuse, 37, 166.  
 ΓΕΛΟΙΑ, joci, applied to Æsop's Fables, 142.  
 ΓΕΝΕΑ, the use of that word, 84.  
 Genealogies, on tables of brass, 75.  
 Generations, according to Herodotus, 85.  
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, his British History, 65.  
 ——— romantic, 195.  
 Geraldinus, his inscriptions, 207, 208.  
 Goths wrote on rocks, 65.  
 Grecian chronology, 83—99.  
 ——— the sentiments of Africanus on that subject, 100.  
 ——— of Justin Martyr, *ibid.*  
 ——— Plutarch, 100—102.  
 ——— Josephus, 102.  
 ——— Varro, 103.  
 ——— Thucydides, 103.  
 ——— Diodorus Siculus, 104.  
 Greeks, their history, 83—107.  
 ——— their first writers, 83.  
 ——— Herodotus, 83, 86.  
 ——— Thucydides, 86.  
 ——— Hippias the Elean, 90.  
 ——— Ephorus of Cuma, 91.  
 ——— Callisthenes, *ibid.*  
 ——— Theopompus, 92.  
 ——— Timæus Siculus, *ibid.*  
 ——— Eratosthenes, 93.  
 ——— Apollodorus, 96.  
 ——— Polybius, 97.  
 ——— Philochorus, &c. 97.  
 Greek writers never refer to the Parian Chronicle, 107.  
 ——— often quote their predecessors, 110.  
 Greeks, modern, Sir Th. Roe's account of them, 223.  
 Grotius, his *Adamus exul*, 200.

# I N D E X.

Gruter, his inscriptions, 214, 216.

Guilandinus, his account of the papyrus, 68.

## H.

**H**ALIRROTHIUS, 24, 150.

Hardouin, his opinion of many inscriptions, 214—216.

Harmodius and Aristogiton assassinate Hipparchus, 35.

Harpocraton, his useful caution, 194.

Hellen, son of Deucalion, 24, 152.

Hellenes, an appellation of the Greeks, 24, 152.

Heraclidæ, their return, 91.

Hercules purified, 28.

——— fetches the belt of Hippolyta, 77.

Hermes Tresmegistus, books ascribed to him, 184.

——— forgeries under his name, 185.

——— reasons assigned for these forgeries, *ibid.*

Hermippus, an accurate historian, 137.

Herodotus, his chronology, 83—86.

——— did not write the Life of Homer, 123.

——— agrees with the sacred writings, 162.

Hesiod flourished, 30.

——— his “Works and Days” written on lead, 66.

——— corrected by Acusilaus, 102.

——— his poems turned into prose, *ibid.*

——— supposed to have been older than Homer, 124.

——— his contemporary, 125.

——— later than Homer, *ibid.*

Hiero, 37, 167.

Hipparchus assassinated, 161.

Hippias deposed, 161, 162.

——— the Elean, 90.

Hody, Dr. his opinion concerning the LXX. 128.

Homer, a fragment of his, 27.

# I N D E X.

- Homer, the age in which he lived, 31, 121—127.  
 ——— the opinion of Apollodorus on that subject, 122.  
 ——— of Archemachus, 123.  
 ——— Aristarchus, *ibid.*  
 ——— Crates Mallotes, 124.  
 ——— Eratosthenes, 123.  
 ——— Euphorbus, 121.  
 ——— Euphorion, *ibid.*  
 ——— Eusebius, 122.  
 ——— Euthemenes, 123.  
 ——— C. Hemina, *ibid.*  
 ——— Herodotus, 121.  
 ——— the author of a Life of Homer, 123.  
 ——— Juvenal, 122.  
 ——— C. Nepos, *ibid.*  
 ——— V. Patereulus, *ibid.*  
 ——— Philochorus, 123.  
 ——— Pliny, 122.  
 ——— Porphyry, 121.  
 ——— Solinus, 122.  
 ——— Sosibius, 121.  
 ——— Theopompus, *ibid.*  
 ——— the Parian Chronicle, 124.  
 ——— supposed to have been contemporary with Hesiod, 125.  
 ——— prior to Hesiod, 125.  
 ——— the most ancient Greek writer, 127, 137.  
 Horace expected his works would be immortal, 61.  
 Horus Apollo, books ascribed to him, 185.  
 Howard, Thomas, his genealogy, 45.  
 ——— Henry, duke of Norfolk, 47, 48.  
 Hyagnis invents flutes, 26.  
 Hypodiceus teaches a chorus, 37.



# I N D E X.

## I.

- J** A M E S, Richard, an account of him, 46.
- Icaria, a borough in Attica, 33.
- Idæi Daëtyli, 26.
- Inscription, the Sigeon, 54.
- the Nemean, *ibid.*
- the Delian, *ibid.*
- the Marmor Sandvicense, 55.
- the Farnesian pillars, *ibid.*
- the Marmor Cyzicenum, *ibid.*
- the Duilian, 213.
- Inscriptions, mistakes in them, 60.
- liable to be defaced, *ibid.*
- on stones, bricks, &c. 65, 66.
- their introductory forms, 71, 73.
- collected with avidity, 219.
- their authority precarious, 206—217.
- many of them supposititious, *ibid.*
- those of Cyriacus Anconitanus, 206.
- of P. Apianus and B. Amantius, 207.
- of Alex. Geraldinus, 207.
- of Curt. Inghiramius, 208, 209.
- of J. Annius, 210, 211.
- of H. Cajadus, 211, 212.
- of F. Ursinus, 213.
- of Fleetwood, *ibid.*
- of Gruter, 214, 216.
- of Pontanus, 214.
- of Pomponius Lætus, *ibid.*
- of Pyrrhus Ligorius, 215.
- Johnson, Dr. his favourable opinion of Lauder, 202.
- his request concerning Ossian, *ibid.*

# I N D E X.

- Ionia, colonized, 30.  
 — its twelve cities, 153—155.  
 Josephus, his fictions, 62, 63.  
 — his opinion of Grecian chronology, 102, 103.  
 — of the Greek writers, 102.  
 — the time of his birth, 103.  
 Isocrates supposes the Athenian constitution had subsisted 1000  
 years, 119.  
 Isthmian games, instituted, 29.  
 ἱστορεω, the use of that word, 63.  
 Junius, Patricius, an account of, 46.  
 Justin Martyr, his opinion of the Grecian chronology, 100.

## K.

- K** ΑΤ' ἐνικαυτον, its acceptation, 31.

## L.

- L** A T I N I U S, Latinus, his account of Anniius, 210.  
 — Lauder, his forgeries, 200, 201.  
 Laws, engraved on wood, 76.  
 — on stone, &c. *ibid.*  
 — of the XII tables, *ibid.*  
 — when engraved, *ibid.*  
 Leagues, engraved on marble, 75.  
 Leuctra, the battle at, 40.  
 Libraries, an account of many celebrated ones, 68.  
 — the Alexandrian, 69.  
 — the Pergamean, *ibid.*  
 Λογιομοιος, fabularum scriptor, 143. Sed vid. Maii Observ. Sacr.  
 l. iii. c. 9. p. 121. Fabric. Bibl. Græc. vol. i. p. 392.  
 Lot's wife, a ridiculous account of her statue, 63.

Lycæa,

# I N D E X.

Lycæa, a festival instituted by Lycaon, 28.

Lycoria, a town on Parnassus, 23.

Lycurgus, when he lived, 101, 102.

Lyfander defeats Conon, 79.

## M.

**M,** No Greek word ends in  $\mu$ , 57.

Maître publishes the Marmora, 49.

———— an account of this work, 49, 50.

Manetho pretends to copy the pillars of Thoth, 62.

Marathon, the battle of, when fought, 36, 78.

Marmor Sandvicense, 55.

Marshall, Sir John, his account of the Grecian chronology, 87.

Masenius, Jacobus, his Sarcotis, 200, 201.

Menestheus reigns at Athens, 29.

Metrophanes, Crit. some account of him, 228—223.

Miletus inhabited at the time of the Trojan war, 30.

———— Neleus builds a new city of that name, 30.

———— its government reëstablished, 78.

Miltiades besieges Paros, *ibid.*

Minerva Hippias, 35.

Minos, [I] reigns in Crete, 26.

———— the Chronicle supposes two princes of that name, 28.

Minos, [II] BANIER's account of him, *ibid.*

———— resides in Paros, 77.

———— sacrifices to the Graces, *ibid.*

———— his four sons by a Parian lady, *ibid.*

Mithridates, epistles ascribed to him, 184.

Musæus, poems ascribed to him, 187.

# I N D E X.

## N.

**N**ELEUS builds Miletus, &c. 30, 153.

———— the disciple of Aristotle, 147.

Nemean games instituted, 29.

Nitocris, when she lived, 85.

Nomos, the meaning of that term, 26.

Numa, his books, 188.

## C.

**O**BJECTIONS :—that the Chronicle contains several archaisms, 56.

———— that it was usual to write on stones, 61.

———— the Chronicle might have been quoted under another name, 112.

———— might have been written by Demetrius Phalereus, 123  
—141.

———— other writings have lain a long time in obscurity, 142  
—148.

———— that the marble is mutilated, 179.

Olympiads, used by Polybius, 97.

———— by the Greek historians, 98.

Olympic catalogues, *ibid.*

———— games, when instituted, 101.

———— year comprehended part of two Julian years, 43.

Orestes, 30.

Orpheus publishes his poems, 27.

———— books ascribed to him. 186.

———— his existence questioned, *ibid.*

Orthian song, 26.

Ossian's works, their authenticity suspected, 202.

Ovid congratulates himself on the immortality of his works, 60.



# I N D E X.

P.

**Π**, the double form of that letter, 53.

Palmerius affirms, that the Chronicle was found at Smyrna, 170.

Panathenæa, when instituted, 25, 152, 153.

Panchæa, a fabulous region, 63.

Pandion reigns at Athens, 27.

Panemus, a Grecian month, 116, 189.

Panionia, instituted, 30.

Papyrus, when the use of it was introduced, 68.

*Παραλιας*, 25.

Parapegma, the meaning of that word, 104—106.

Parchment, when used for books, 67, 70.

Parian Chronicle, A GENERAL ACCOUNT of it, 43—51.

————— when engraved, 43.

————— brought to England, 45.

————— copied by Selden, 46.

————— a great part of it lost, 47.

————— carefully preserved at Oxford, 50.

————— its CHARACTERS have NO CERTAIN MARKS of antiquity, 53—58.

————— not engraved for PRIVATE USE, 59—61.

————— not engraved by PUBLIC AUTHORITY, 71—82.

————— records the transactions of different countries, 82.

————— PRIOR to any settled chronology, 83—107.

————— its singular precision, 107—109.

————— not MENTIONED by any ANCIENT WRITER, 108—111, 140.

————— OBJECTIONS against the argument from the SILENCE of the ancients, 112—148.

————— the author's date of the TROJAN WAR, 116.

————— the age of HOMER, 124—126.

# I N D E X.

Parian Chronicle differs from the Chronicon of Eusebius, 119.

———— not composed by DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS,  
129—141.

———— the beginning supplied, 132.

———— ostentatiously engraved on marble, 148.

———— seems to have been collected from OTHER  
WRITERS, 149—159.

———— PARACHRONISMS in some of the epochas, 160  
—168.

———— the history of the DISCOVERY, 169—180.

———— where found, uncertain, 169—171.

———— whether engraved on one tablet, or more, 170.

———— whether the author was an Ionian, or not, 171.

———— purchased by Mr. Peiresc, 176.

———— its first possessors, *ibid.*

———— to be received with caution, why, 217.

———— not regarded by Sir Isaac Newton, 218.

———— not a despicable work, *ibid.*

———— its origin APOCRYPHAL, 221.

Parians send a colony into the Adriatic, 79.

Paros, the history of that island, 77—80.

—— governed by the sons of Minos, *ibid.*

—— its various names, 80.

—— its extent, *ibid.*

—— its first inhabitants, 77.

—— attacked by Miltiades, 78.

Peiresc, M. de, an account of him, 175.

———— purchases the Chronicon, 176, 178.

———— his character by Goguet, 177.

———— never in Asia, 179.

Peloponnesian war, its beginning and end, 79, 87.

Pergamus, kings of, 70.

Persius explodes credulity and superstition, 225.

Petavius, on the time of the destruction of Troy, 118.

Petavius

# I N D E X.

- Petavius affirms, that the Chronicle was found at Smyrna, 170.  
 Petty, William, an account of, 45, 172—175.  
 Phædrus, when he wrote, 142.  
 ——— seems to be noticed by Martial, *ibid.*  
 ——— not mentioned by Seneca, 143.  
 ——— reasons assigned for this omission, 143, 144.  
 Phalaris, epistles ascribed to him, 184, 189.  
 Pheidon invents weights and measures, 31.  
 ——— when he lived, 160, 161.  
 Philadelphus, his splendid age, 44.  
 ——— married his sister, 128.  
 ——— his rigorous treatment of Demetrius Phalereus, 136.  
 ——— said to have bought all Aristotle's works, 147.  
 Philip, king of Macedon, 41.  
 Philippus, a coin mentioned by Varro, 180.  
 Philochorus, 98.  
 Pillar of salt, 63.  
 Pillars of Seth, Hermes, Acicarus, 61, 62.  
 ——— of Osiris, Echnus, 75.  
 ——— erected by the Greeks and Romans, 75.  
 Piræus, when fortified, 32.  
 Pisistratus, 33.  
 Plataeæ, or Plataea, the battle of, 37.  
 Plato, dialogues falsely ascribed to him, 190.  
 Plautus, comedies falsely ascribed to him, 192.  
 ——— his description of Club-island, 218.  
 Pleias poëtarum, 44.  
 Pliny, a mistake in his N. H. 65.  
 ——— on the Babylonian calculations, *ibid.*  
 ——— his account of the papyrus, &c. 66.  
 Plutarch, his opinion of Grecian chronology, 100—102.  
 Poëtarum pleias, 44.  
 Polybius, an account of his writings, 97—99.  
 Prideaux publishes the Marmora, 48.

# I N D E X.

Prideaux, his death, 48.

—— his character of Aristeus, 44.

—— his opinion concerning the LXX. 128.

—— his remarks on the forgeries of Annius, 195.

Pfalmanazar, his forgeries, 199.

Ptolemean kings, 70.

Pythian games, celebrated, 33, 155.

## R.

**R**AWLINSON asserts, that the Chronicle was found in Paros, 169.

Roe, Sir Thomas, his letters to archbishop Abbot, 45, 173, 221—223.

—— to lord Arundel, 172—174.

—— to the duke of Buckingham, 174, 175.

Rowley, poems ascribed to him 203, 204.

## S.

**S**ALAMIS, the battle of, 36, 79.

Salmasius, his explanation of the word *parapegma*, 105.

Samson purchases the Chronicon, 176.

—— imprisoned, 179.

Sanchoniatho pretends to have copied ancient records, 62.

—— the books of Taaut, 64.

Sappho sails to Sicily, 32.

Selden publishes the *Marmora*, 46.

—— dies, 48.

—— his works published, 49.

Semiramis, when she lived, 85.

Septuagint version, when made, 128.

Sesostris, his pillars, 62.

Seth, his pillars, 61, 62.



# I N D E X.

- Seventy interpreters, their cells, 138.  
 Sibyl sells her books to Tarquin, 180.  
 Sibylline oracles, fanatical impostures, 225.  
 Simonides invents the art of memory, 37.  
 ——— dies, 39.  
 Simson, his construction of a passage in D. Laertius, 136.  
 Socrates, dies, 39, 131.  
 ——— a dispute concerning his age, 130.  
 Solon, his interview with Cræsus, 102.  
 ——— when he was archon, *ibid.*  
 Sophocles gains a victory in tragedy, 38.  
 ——— dies, 39.  
 Sosibius, his date of the Trojan war, 113.  
 Spanheim, his character of Aristeas, 138.  
 Stesichorus goes into Greece, 36.  
 ——— the second of that name, 40.  
 Stillingfleet, his account of literary frauds, 182, 214.  
 Syncellus, a passage in his chronography corrected, 125.

## T.

- T** A A U T, called by the Greeks Hermes, 64.  
 Tatian, his chronological citations, 109.  
 Taubman, his *Bellum Angelicum*, 200, 201.  
 Telestes, 39.  
 Temenus, one of the Heraclidæ, 160, 161.  
 Terpander, 32.  
 Tertullian, a remarkable passage in his works, 63.  
 Teucer builds Salamis, 30.  
 Themistocles, not archon eponymus, 32.  
 ——— epistles falsely ascribed to him, 189.  
 ——— fortifies Piræus, 32.  
 ——— lays the Parians under contributions, 79.  
 Theopompus, 92.

Theseus

# I N D E X.

- Theseus unites the twelve cities of Attica, 29.  
 ——— the time of his birth, 101.  
 Thespis exhibits tragedy, 34.  
 Thucydides, the authenticity of a passage in his works suspected,  
   31, 32.  
 ——— styles his history an everlasting possession, 61.  
 ——— his chronology, 86, 87.  
 ——— his division of the year, 86.  
 ——— his opinion of Grecian chronology, 103.  
 Timæus Siculus, his writings and character, 92, 93.  
 Treaties, engraved on pillars, 75.  
 Triptolemus, 27.  
 Troy, the siege of that city commenced, 29.  
 ——— an error in the date of that event, *ibid.*  
 ——— the epocha of the Trojan war, 113.  
 ——— the opinion of the ancients on that subject, 113—118.  
 ——— of Apollodorus, 114.  
 ——— of Arctes, 115.  
 ——— of P. Cato, 113.  
 ——— of Censorinus, 114, 115.  
 ——— of Dicaearchus, 115.  
 ——— of Diodorus, 114.  
 ——— of Dionysius Argivus, 113.  
 ——— of Dionysius Halicarnassæus, 114.  
 ——— of Duris Samius, 115.  
 ——— of Eratosthenes, 113.  
 ——— of Eusebius, 114.  
 ——— of the Greek chronologists, *ibid.*  
 ——— of the author of the Life of Homer, 115.  
 ——— of Paterculus, *ibid.*  
 ——— of Solinus, 114.  
 ——— of Sosibius, 113.  
 ——— of Tatian, 114.  
 ——— of Timæus, *ibid.*  
 ——— of the Parian Chronicle, 116.

Troy,

## I N D E X.

Troy, the day of the month, on which the city was taken, 116, 117.

—— the opinion of the ancients on this subject, 116.

—— the sentiments of the moderns, 117.

Tyrant, the import of that word, 33.

Tyrtæus commands the Spartan army, 32.

### V.

**V**ARRERIUS on the decree of pope Gelasius, 198.

Varro, on the papyrus, 68.

—— his division of time, 103.

—— his account of the Sibyl, 180.

Veremundus, when he wrote, 182.

Vespasian restores 3000 brazen plates, 76.

Vossius, on the word *parapegma*, 105.

### W.

**W**ILKINS publishes Selden's works, 49.

Writing, on pillars, stones, bricks, &c. 65, 75.

### X.

**X**, signifies 600, 71.

Xanthus, a poet of Sardes, 39.

Xenophon, when born, 87.

—— his Grecian history, *ibid.*

—— the Olympiads in his history an interpolation, 88.

—— his *Cyropædia*, 89, 90.

Xerxes reigns in Persia, 36.

—— makes a bridge over the Hellespont, 36, 156, 164.

—— his invasion of Greece, 164, 165.

### Y.

**Y**OUNG, Patrick, some account of him, 46.

# ERRATA.

p. 4.	l. 11.	read,	κ]α-
9.	7.	—	Τεω.
15.	16.	—	Helleſponto.
18.	5.	—	Μικας[ο]ς.
27.	18.	—	Phurnutus.
34.	20.	—	εδιδαξεν.
37.	34.	—	An ſeni.
84.	9.	—	conſiſt.
85.	20.	—	πεντηκοντα.
100.	1.	—	his.
109.	15.	—	are. 13
127.	4.	—	Sextus Empiricus.
129.	34.	—	literariam.
156.	12.	—	Helleſponto.
163.	21.	—	πυλαια.
176.	14.	—	Peireſc.
195.	33.	—	prophecies.
211.	20.	—	the origin of Viterbo, &c. The Latin

translation of this paſſage, p. 210, is obſcure and equivocal. Notwithſtanding the word *longè*, and the extravagance of the aſſertion, it is very probable, that Annius's rodomontade is to be underſtood in this ſenſe :

——“ the origin of Viterbo, which was built by Iſis and Oſiris, two thouſand years before Rome was founded by Romulus.”

I have not been able to meet with the original of the learned Spaniard, from which Schottus made his Latin tranſlation.